

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV

FEBRUARY, 1904

NO. 8

Marxian Idealism.

IT is told of Marx that once when he found himself among a group of French Socialists one of them asked of him, "To what school would you belong if you lived in France?"

"I do not know," was the reply; "but in any case I would not be a Marxist."

We give the story for what it is worth, but true or false, it characterizes very vividly the transformation or rather the deformation undergone by Marxism in passing the frontier and undergoing the dangerous trial of translations, resumes, and literary or oratorical adaptations.

The same thing has happened to Darwin and in a certain way to all great initiators. From the mass of penetrating observations and careful yet daring deductions their popularizers and the public after them, have retained only fag-ends of phrases and fragments of ideas.

Darwin carried on his investigations during nearly half a century. He wrote "The Origin of Species" and "The Descent of Man." He revolutionized the natural sciences, and through the natural sciences our conception of the universe; but for the immense majority his doctrine reduces itself to two things: "Man is descended from the monkey"—since the Darwinian hypothesis includes a common ancestor for man: "the struggle for life is a factor of progress," which is used to justify the crushing of the feeble by the strong, although Darwin repeatedly insisted upon the advantages of association in the struggle for existence.

Karl Marx gave such a masterly exposition of the socialist thought that he temporarily eclipsed his more illustrious predecessors. He created a new politic. He transformed historical methods. He set forth a definite critique of the capitalist regime. After such an effort what was there left for the great mass of pamphleteers and journalists? A few formulas such as "Labor is

the source of all value," "The class struggle determines the course of history," or better still, "The mode of production of material existence determines in a general way the social, political and intellectual process of life."

Note that these quotations are not incorrect, but they are separated from their context. They have been given an absolute value and they have been abstracted from the corollaries or the modifications that originally accompanied them. So it has happened that through a series of impoverishments and condensations we have nothing left but a scheme, a skeleton of a doctrine which bears very little resemblance to the real doctrine of Marx.

For many people, for example, the materialistic conception of history, that corner stone of Marxism, denies any efficacy to the ideal. Morality, law, religion or philosophy are epiphenomena, reflections, with neither warmth nor strength, the products or sub-products of economic activity. As for socialism it is nothing more than a process of dispossession of the capitalists. It should have nothing to do with any problem that does not concern directly or indirectly the production and distribution of wealth. Those who seek to extend it to embrace other questions such as ethical progress, anti-clericalism or governmental institutions are dreamers and followers of side issues. What do we care about Dreyfus or Mercier, a Ministry or the Congregations, Republic or Monarchy: "get ready for the social revolution, everything else will come with that."

It is unnecessary to say that from this point of view historical materialism offers small welcome to those who come to socialism or are drawn towards it by sentimental reasons. Our friend Paul Lafargue, who loves nothing so much as terrifying the timid by exaggerated paradoxes, has lately stated in a very beautiful manner that Justice, Liberty, Fraternity, Progress are false Gods, manufactured by the Bourgeoisie as a substitute for the Christian Gods in order to maintain the slavery of the people.¹

They continue to think that ideas are forces, that justice is not a word, that law, politics and religion may perhaps find their final explanation in the "Underlying economic factor," but do not exercise any considerable influence upon social evolution. In fact, if Marxism denied this influence, if it assumed, as is too often taught, to reduce the social question to a stomach question, and to imprison socialism within the field of material interests, it would be the worse from Marxism. The socialist conscience would never submit to such a contraction of its ideal. It would never consent to deliver over the whole domain of spiritual activity to the old religions and philosophies.

But let us hasten to say that those who thus interpret the doc-

(1) See for examples Lafargue's *Idealisme et materialisme* in *L'Ere Nouvelle*, Jul. 1, 1893, pages 50 *et seq.*

trine of Marx only show that they understand it very poorly. It is a case of repeating the statement of Laubardamont. Show me a line of a man's hand and I will find enough in it to hang him.

In as complex a work as those of Marx and Renan, nothing is easier than to pick out certain texts for the purpose of making their authors say nearly anything that is desired. But it is the entire work in its genesis and its development which must be studied if we are to understand the real thought of the author.

If this simply honest method is applied to the intellectual products of Marx it becomes easy to explain the wholly apparent harshness of his materialism; the systematic affectation of never having recourse to sentimental arguments in a work which is from beginning to end a sharp and burning appeal to the sentiment of justice. All this is plainly only a very natural reaction against the habits of thought and language which prevailed around him.

Let us return in mind to the years which immediately preceded the revolution of 1848. Sentimentalism reigned supreme. Utopian socialism stood opposed to bourgeois idealism. Social philosophy, according to the words of the Communist Manifesto, "concealed its lack of ideas under a robe of speculative cobwebs embroidered with flowers of rhetoric and steeped in the dew of sickly sentiment." In Germany the Hegelian Right was sunk in complete mysticism. In France and England nearly all the followers of Fourier, St. Simon and Owen were exhausting themselves in fanciful appeals to the good will of the bourgeoisie rather than work with the laborers. In short the majority of the socialists, like the great majority of their adversaries, agreed in making confession to a sort of sociological spiritualism. Ideas according to them moved in a higher plane under the cover of meagre suggestions of material interest, but in a state of what was thought to be absolute independence of the objective conditions of social life.

It is at this moment that Marx appeared in an environment created by a group of numerous forerunners.

Replying to Proudhon, who had sought to create "*la Philosophie de la Misere*," he published "*la Misere de la Philosophie*." Stating definitely a conception the germ of which is to be found in many of his previous works, he wrote that celebrated passage which reappeared continuously in his work as a *leit motiv*, the theme that economic necessity dominates all the spiritual life of humanity. "Social relations are closely united to the productive forces. In acquiring new productive forces, men change their mode of production. In changing the mode of production, the manner of gaining their livelihood, they change all their social relations. The hand mill gave a society with the lord of the manor; the steam mill, a society with industrial capitalists. The

same men who establish social relations in conformity with their system of material production, also bring forth the principles, the ideas, the categories, conformable to their social relations. Thus, these ideas, these categories are just as little eternal as the relations they express. They are historic and transitory products."¹

Such in a condensed form, but substantially correct as far as it goes, is the main idea of Marxism. Is it necessary for us to emphasize the revolutionary import of this point of view?

This idea is that in the order of social things progress gives way to the unchanging, realism supplants ideology. According to the very words of Marx, the dialectic of Hegel which went on its head is set upon its feet. History ceases to be literature or metaphysics. Capitalism no longer appears as a definite regime, but as an historic product which bears within itself a new regime. Socialism escapes the makers of systems to enter definitely into the scientific phase. Certainly it becomes the socialists even less than any one else to attribute to a single man the merit of this salutary revolution. This would be to devote to his profit, as individual property, a collective product.

We may leave to the St. Simonians, if any remain, the religion of a new Messiah. We know that the materialistic conception of history does not belong exclusively to Marx, any more than evolution to Darwin, or the "Essay on the Wealth of Nations" to Adam Smith. And we know also—it is the old story of Christopher Columbus' egg—that many of the Marxist ideas appear so self-evident to-day that all originality is denied to those who first brought them to light. Everybody now talks historic materialism just as M. Jourdain talked prose.

When the coal beds were discovered in the Campino Limbourgeoise, the bishop of Liege concluded that socialism would soon be born in that region.

When the English made war on the Transvaal in order to maintain the right of the Uitlanders no one doubted that the individual interests of the proprietors of the gold mines and the commercial interests of the Empire constituted the true motives of their intervention.

Even those who fight most fiercely the theories of Marx recognize the necessity of economic interpretations of history.

"Historic materialism," writes Professor Masaryk, "or better expressed, the more exact appreciation of the importance of the economic factors and the reduction to their true value of ideological influences upon the life and development of society must, henceforth, make a part of the undisputed inheritance of sociology, history and politics."²

(1) L. Marx—*Misère de la Philosophie, Réponse à la Philosophie de la Misère*, de M. Proudhon, 1847—page 151 de l'Édit Giard et Brière, Paris, 1896.

(2) Masaryk—*Die philosophischen und sociologischen Grundlagen des Marxismus*. Page 167, Wien-Kronegen, 1899.

But if the adversaries of Marx finally accept the fundamentals of his thesis, it is only to speak with all the more bad humor of the Marxian exclusiveness and to hurl the double reproach upon historic materialism of ignoring the importance of the natural agents which determine the economic organization of society, and of denying, on the other hand, the very apparent influence of the moral and intellectual factors.

The folly of these reproaches has been shown many times. We think, nevertheless, that it may be useful to again review them since we see them continuously repeated by the pens of anti-socialist writers.

In the first place, it is very necessary for us to recognize that the economic structure of society is not a primitive fact; that it is the result of the relations that have risen between the population and its environment. That, as a consequence, it is necessary to take account in the explanation of social phenomena of race, climate, natural productivity of the soil, and geographic situation.

All this is evident, but where do we find that such premises have been denied by the founders of historic materialism?

If it is necessary to quote texts in order to prove the contrary, we might cite among others the characteristic passage in the third volume of *Capital*. After having called attention to the dependence and subordination of political forms to their economic base, Marx adds: "This does not mean that the same economic base, at least in its essential features, may not present in reality the most infinite variations, due to innumerable economic circumstances and natural conditions, relations of races, historic influences, &c., variations which can be understood only by an analysis of the existing circumstances."¹

It is therefore incorrect to attribute to historic materialism the absurd pretension of explaining the economic structure of society without taking account of the natural circumstances which determine that structure.

Marx and Engels did not need the light of M. Fouillee or M. Masaryk to enable them to see that the negroes scattered through the forests of equatorial Africa would necessarily have a different political and social economy from that of the Aryans inhabiting the islands of the Aegean Sea, or the Semites living upon the banks of the Yellow river. But while they realized the tremendous importance of natural environment and racial characteristics from the static point of view, they insisted, on the other hand, that from the dynamic point of view, their importance was *nil*.

In reality, according to them, it is not the spontaneous variations in natural conditions which produce the continuous modifications of the social structure. Climate, race, geographical situa-

(1) Marx—*Das Kapital* III., page 325. Hambourg-Meißner, 1894. Traduc. Franc., page 387. Paris, Girard et Brière, 1902.

tion and fertility of the soil are in themselves but passive elements and unvarying factors; the only active element, the revolutionary factor *par excellence* is human industry, economic conditions, the changes which take place in the method of production of the necessities of life.

If the climate of France is no longer identical with what it was in the time of Caesar, it is because changes in methods of cultivation have modified the water supply, or distribution of forests. If the ethnical characteristics of the population have undergone great alterations since the Roman epoch, it is because the essentials of the social order have provoked a barbarian invasion. If the basin of the Mediterranean is no longer the center of civilization, it is because the development of the means of transportation have displaced the old commercial routes. If natural resources are to-day capable of satisfying infinitely more needs, it is because science and art have found methods of utilizing them, and so far as the products of the soil are concerned, of increasing them. In short, nature does not change of itself—it is man who changes nature.

Such is the thesis. It certainly contains a large amount of truth. Nevertheless, we cannot accept it without making certain reservations.

To be sure, instances may be cited where changes produced in the social structure depend exclusively on spontaneous variations in natural conditions. The industrial and commercial decadence of Bruges, for example, cannot be explained without taking into consideration the circumstances which brought about the filling up of the Zwiijn and deprived the citizens of Bruges of their communication with the ocean.

To take a still more general example it is not possible to write sociology without investigating the influences of the progress achieved by the population in all manifestations of social life.

Let us observe, however, that progress in a rudimentary state of culture and industry is inflexibly confined within narrow limits. That, on the other hand, the spontaneous variations of physical environment may generally be considered as secondary factors in regard to the artificial variations resulting from the work of man.

Taking these things as a whole, and the conditions of environment alone during the short duration of an historic period, it is certainly human activity which contributes most efficiently to modify the face of the globe. And naturally its incessant transformations are not confined to natural conditions. It constitutes the principal motive force of history; it determines primarily political and religious revolutions. But it does not follow, and the Marxists in no way claim that intellectual and moral factors play no role in social evolution.

Nevertheless, this opinion is continually ascribed to them.

During last year, for example, at the French Philosophical Society, Halevey maintained in opposition to Sorel that the reaction of the spiritual upon the material, of the ideal upon the real is an impossibility according to Marx; that the essential of historic materialism is just the affirmation of this impossibility.¹

It should always be recognized that, in order to interpret Marxism in this manner, it is necessary to refer not alone to the writings of Frederick Engels, but to those of Marx himself, and this where the latter instead of speaking as part of a systematic philosophy, was writing off hand as chief journalist of a party.

As for us, we do not admit the justice of such necessarily arbitrary quotations from a work every part of which is reciprocally complementary and explanatory. Moreover, it is not alone in the political pamphlets, or in the circulars of the International, that Marx attaches great importance to the action of ideas. His thesis on Feuerbach, written at Brussels in 1845, also states very clearly that philosophy ought not be confined to the contemplation of things, without also being the means of acting upon things.²

On the other hand, we can only understand Marxism by taking account of the alterations in its interpretation and developments that have been given it in perfect accord with Marx by his intellectual Siamese Twin, Frederic Engels. Indeed, the letters written in 1890-95 are known in which Engels declares in express terms that the "political, juridical, philosophical and religious evolutions have for a base economic evolution, but that they react upon each other and upon the economic base." We think, then, that we are right in concluding that when the Hegelian dialectic was set upon its feet, Marxism did not cut off its head.

Moreover, may it not be claimed that in their effort to react against the excessive contrary tendency the founders of historic materialism have *undervalued* the importance of the ideological factors?³

But in our opinion it is more correct to say that they have only *understated*, because notwithstanding appearances, their entire work is animated with the powerful breath of idealism.

In order to criticise capitalism, they have recourse to the most abstract forms of logic, but in the last analysis this logic is founded upon a postulate of the moral order: justice demands that each laborer receive the entire product of his labor.

(1) Bulletin de la Societe Francaise de Philosophie, Mai, 1902. Libr. Colin, Paris.

(2) Engels—Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang de Klassischen deutschen philosophie mit Anhang. Karl Marx über Feuerbach vom Jahr, 1845. Stuttgart: Dietz, 1903.

Engels—Feuerbach, The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. Tr. by Austin Lewis. Charles H. Kerr & Company, Chicago, 1903.

(3) "In our replies to our adversaries in proof of the essential principle (the economic side) which was denied by them, we have not always had the time, the facility and the opportunity of dwelling sufficiently upon the other factors which participate in the reciprocal action." Fr. Engels, Letters of 1890, published in the *Sozialistische Akademiker*, October, 1895.

To secure the triumph of socialism, they reckon upon the action of economic forces, but they reckon equally upon the action of moral and intellectual forces. The whole Communist Manifesto is an urgent appeal to the conscience of the proletariat, its energy, its initiative, and its sentiment of solidarity.

Furthermore, and this point cannot be insisted upon too strongly, the action of the economic forces themselves necessarily presuppose the continued intervention of the human mind.

It is said, and it is right to say it, that the construction of a railroad, the establishment of a factory, the discovery of a coal bed, the invention of a new machine influence, politics or religion, much more than any writings or speeches. But what are inventions, discoveries, or technical revolutions but the result of intelligence working on matter?

"Historic materialism," says Karl Kautsky, "far from denying the motive power of the human mind in society, only gives a special explanation different from previous explanations of the action of this force. Mind directs society not as the master of economic conditions but as their servant. It is they that dictate to-day the problems that it must solve, and they furnish the means for the solution. The immediate end that the human mind follows in solving these problems may be an end foreseen and desired. But each of the solutions must have consequences which it cannot foresee, and which frequently run counter to these expectations."¹

We would like to be able to quote more fully from the complete and interesting study from which we borrow this passage.

This would be the best means of showing the injustice of the reproaches which are ordinarily laid to those who are called, very incorrectly, the orthodox Marxists. Like Marx himself, these people are reacting from their defense against the mystics. For them, as for everybody, an act of production or exchange is necessarily a psycho-physical act. An economic organism, the same as any other social structure, is a creation of intelligence brought in contact with reality. This which they call, improperly by the way, *historic materialism*, might as well be called *idealism*, since they admit that every social phenomenon is at the same time an intellectual phenomenon. It is unnecessary to say, however, that this Marxist idealism is essentially different from that idealism which is ordinarily expressed by the word.

Instead of seeing in Politics, Morals, Religion and Philosophy, formations which are totally or partially independent of the economic environment, it declares, on the contrary, that the economic structure of society is the actual basis by means of which all the superstructure of religious, philosophical or other

(1) Kautsky—Was will und kann die Materialistische Geschichtsauffassung leisten? Neue Zeit, 1896-1897, page 231.

institutions for each determined period, *in the last instance*, find their explanation.¹

And here it appears to us that we may express doubts, state reserves, or at least insert interrogation points. Certainly we recognize fully the preponderance of economic phenomena which are at the same time the most simple and the most general. *Primo vivere deinde philosophari*. We have always recognized the revolutionary influence of industrial transformations; Auguste Comte himself insisted upon this point in the sixth volume of his *Positive Philosophy*. Finally, we admit the impossibility of a rational interpretation of the history of law, morality or of religions, without taking count of the changes occurring in the methods of production of the material life.

But is it necessary to go farther; is it necessary to admit, as Marx has done, or at least appears to do at certain times, that the mode of production of material life is the determining cause of the social, political and spiritual *processus* of life? Like the conception which tends to see in the ideologies only the simple products, direct or indirect, of economic conditions, it is exposed to the same difficulties as philosophic materialism which declares that matter creates man, and that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile.

It is true that we cannot conceive the nature of pure mind; we cannot separate thought from the material substratum. But instead of seeking to prove either an essential difference or a relation of cause and effect between mind and matter, monism considers the one and the other as two aspects of a single substance. In the same way we do not think that the morality, philosophy and religion of an epoch are independent of the economic conditions present or past. We cannot disentangle the social-psychic from the social-physic. But because the evolution of ideas is indissolubly united to material evolution, it does not follow that one is the cause of the other.

To speak plainly we can scarcely understand what is meant when people say, as they sometimes do, that the symphonies of Beethoven or Mozart, the metaphysics of Kant or Spinoza, the religion of Mohammed or Christ are products of the social environment amid which they were born. This is much the same as if we were to say that the plants are products of the soil because their seeds require soil for germination. In the same way that plants could not grow without the sun, so the works of art, religion or philosophy would not exist without the economic structure, without social conditions which render their appearance possible; but it is equally true that they would not exist without the human mind.

(1) Engels—Herrn Eugen Dühring's Umwälzung der Wissenschaft. p. 12. Stuttgart, Dietz, 1894.

As a consequence, unless we are to fall into absurdities, it is necessary to say that ideologies are the product, not of the economic environment, but of the relations which arise between the human mind and the economic environment. Even this last expression appears to us to be too narrow. The diversity of economic or social conditions—this terrestrial germ of religions or philosophies—may furnish an explanation of the differences which they present, but it does not give us the reason of their resemblance, of their general common ideas. Whatever may actually be the economic structure of a society, whether it is composed of Chaldean shepherds or 20th century proletarians, man is led by the force of events to seek solutions, or to receive solutions ready made, for a series of problems having no direct relation with the modes of production of material life: such, for example, as the existence or non-existence of God; free will or determinism, the mortality or immortality of the individual soul. And physical or religious conceptions also are themselves the reflections, or rather the representations of idealizations of complete reality, not simply of economic reality.

But if their permanent characteristics correspond to the unchanging in nature, then the history of their variations, or of their details, is only possible when we study at the same time the details which exist and the transformations which are produced in the social economy.

What is true of the history of religions, or philosophies, is still more true of the history of law or political institutions.

Historic materialism—since it is necessary to use this name sanctified by custom¹—appears to us then primarily as a method, as a means, of explaining the superficial manifestations of the collective life by the less evident but more effective phenomena which arise in the economic sub-soil of society.

When a historic event is studied that which is apparent are the avowed motives proclaimed by the principles.

Thus when the United States declared war with Spain, it was done, we are told, in order to assist the Cuban revolutionists, and to secure the independence of the Colonies which were scandalously exploited by the Home Government, and to grant assistance to the *reconcentrados* who were being starved by General Weyler.

And to be sure these liberal and humanitarian reasons were not without effect in impressing public opinion, rousing allegiance and exciting enthusiasm; but if we are to know the other

(1) Benedetto Croce says correctly, as we think, “* * * I regret that the word materialism has been chosen, since it has no specific justification and gives rise to so many misunderstandings which are made use of by its adversaries. So far as history is concerned, I prefer the name ‘realistic conception of history,’ which better indicates its character of opposition to all teleologies, and to all metaphysics in the domain of history. *Matérialisme de l’Histoire et Economie Marxiste*, trad. par. A. Bonnet, Paris, Girard et Brière, 1901.

motives of the war—those which the people interested would scarcely avow—those which on the contrary they took the greatest pains to conceal—it is indispensable to have recourse to the materialistic interpretation of history; it is in the economic undercurrent, beneath the triple layer of moral, political or religious protestations that careful investigation ends by these discoveries: that American capitalists have long sought the conquest of Cuba; they have between thirty and fifty million dollars invested in the sugar refineries; insurrections were always in progress; commercial relations suffered from these insurrections; the intolerable fiscal policy of Spain hindered trade; the United States in the midst of a crisis due to over-production, was compelled at any cost to extend its market and secure a footing in the extreme Orient and establish itself in the Pacific; and for the success of this imperialist conception the disappearance of the Spanish colonies was essential. Hence we have "*Vive Cuba libre*," "Down upon the monks in the Philippines."

To overlook these concealed motives would be to ignore the prime importance of economic phenomena in social life and would be either for the historian, or statesman, to condemn one's self to a radical misunderstanding of social evolution.

But, on the other hand, we may repeat that a no less dangerous misunderstanding arises from an exclusive attention to concealed motives and trying to explain everything by the direct action of economic causes, while rejecting the influence of the ideas and sentiments, and of the political, moral or religious influences on the progress of events.

It is by taking this false point of view that certain socialists, wrongly calling themselves Marxists, despise or even condemn certain forms of activity which may render valuable service to the proletariat.

Some, like C. Cornelissen, who is a disciple of Marx and Bakunine at the same time, do not wish to consider political action at all and place all their hopes in the autonomous organization of the working class.²

Others profess the most complete contempt for all moral action. Under the excuse, for example, that alcoholism has economic causes, they obstinately refuse to do what is possible within the present society to check this scourge. Others finally see in the struggle against the Church only a simple derivative and declare that the religious question must be solved by the social revolution and that it is wholly useless, even hurtful, to occupy ourselves with it at present.

But these various opinions which, as we believe, rest upon

(1) Beer—*Die Vereinigten Staaten im Jahre, 1898*. Neue Zeit, 1898-1899, page 676-708.

(2) C. Cornelissen—*En marche vers la société nouvelle*.

a theoretical error, find less and less approval among the working class.

Everywhere, indeed, and notably in England, pure and simple trade unionism is on the decline. The working class see the advantages which the possession of the public powers give to the bourgeoisie and strive to conquer those powers.

On the other hand, moral questions hitherto neglected, now appear upon the programmes of all socialist congresses; in Belgium, in Switzerland, in Austria, thanks to the work of Marxists, such as Otto Lange or Victor Adler, the Socialist Anti-alcoholic propaganda is beginning to pass beyond the stage of wordy resolutions and platonic affirmations. Perhaps the objection will be raised that our German comrades still smile, with their very large smile, when one speaks to them of the struggle against alcohol; but we might reply that these same indulgent and superior smiles formerly welcomed us when we praised the benefits of socialist co-operation.

As to the religious question we have only to consider the actual political situation of Europe in order to convince ourselves that the immense majority of labor parties are inclined to exaggerate rather than underestimate the very real importance of the struggle against clericalism.

Moreover, the conscious socialists will have failed in their most elementary duty if, by a continuous return to their fundamental principles, they do not utilize all their energy to retain or to restore the proletariat to the basis of the class struggle.

Such is primarily the practical import of the celebrated declaration inscribed in the program of the social-democracy by the congress at Erfurt: "*Erklärung der Religion zur Privatsache.*"

Religion is a private affair; that expresses the fact that socialism as a political party appeals to all laborers to struggle against capitalism without paying any attention to the philosophical or religious opinions that they may profess; that expresses the fact also that in societies where antagonisms of faiths reflects the antagonisms of material interests, the separation of the Church and the State and the secularization of all public services appears to be the only generally acceptable solution. With this interpretation and to this degree we fully agree with the Erfurt formula. It signifies, taken as a whole, freedom of conscience and independence of the civil power.

But it is necessary to observe that this formula contains grave defects; it leads to equivocations; it is full of misunderstandings. It may be understood and many have so understood it as limiting socialism to political and economic questions alone: "Let us concern ourselves with the things of earth; leave heaven to angels and the monks."

Those who speak in this manner do not appreciate the pro-

found reaction exercised upon social physics by religious metaphysics. As we have said, religions are both cosmologies and sociologies. Catholicism, for example, does not confine itself to offering an explanation of the world. It does not treat of faith alone, but also of morals. In the name of a revelation, in which the majority of the wealthy no longer believe, it seeks to impose a social morality, whose precepts are in direct antagonism with the temporal interests of the poor. The day that this double proof is made, and the poor understand that the rich do not believe because such belief is scientifically impossible for them, and that, on the other hand, they conceal their incredulity because they are interested in the credulity of others, that day the hour of Catholicism will have sounded. But it must not be forgotten that we can only destroy when we replace. If the overthrow of the old faith is to be complete, socialism must raise itself above the ground of immediate concerns.

It is necessary that to that conception of the Church which embraces the entire man, socialism oppose a no less integral conception of law, morals, society and of the world. And to carry such a work to a successful end no effort should be spared to cement that fruitful alliance of the thinkers and the proletarians which Marx announced in these words in the *Annales Franco-Prussian* of 1844: "The movement of emancipation has philosophy for its head, the proletariat for its heart. The ideal of philosophy cannot be realized without the uplifting of the proletariat. The proletariat cannot rise without the realization of the philosophical ideal. But when all the internal conditions of this moment have been fulfilled we expect to announce the resurrection of Germany by the crowing of the Gallic cock." Nearly sixty years have passed since these lines were written. A long time was necessary, much longer than Marx thought, before his prediction began to be fulfilled.

The 19th century was at the same time the century of the workers and the century of the scientists. But, even in these last years science and democracy tended separately towards the same end, like the waters of those rivers which flow together without mixing. Henceforth, however, this union is made or is on the point of being made.

Such institutions as the *Universite Nouvelle*, the *Universite populaire*, and the University extension work form contacts and facilitate the union. The scientists go to the people, the people go to the scientists. Little by little the distrust disappears. The obstacles are being removed. Theory and practice are being reconciled. In the dawn of the 20th century the Gallic cock is making himself heard. On the other side of the Rhine the workers are rising and throughout the whole world mens' voices repeat the words of Marx: "Workers of the world, unite!"

Translated by A. M. Simons.

EMILE VANDERVELDE.

A Study of Race Prejudice.

THE skillful physician, seeking to make a cure, studies the causes of the disease. The Socialist party of the South is up against the problem of race prejudice. Everything which sheds light on the morbid history of that problem—that diseased condition of the popular mind—for which Socialism must find a solution, or remedy, is of value. I read with interest the three articles on the subject in the November issue of the REVIEW, but it seemed to me that there was a very important feature of the case which was not fully considered.

It would take too much space to sketch what the South suffered in the Era of Reconstruction. Had the spirit of forgiveness shown at Appomattox ruled in the halls of Congress, there would be no race prejudice today. That is almost a truism in the South. But the poor, ignorant, power-intoxicated negro, so late a slave, now empowered to legislate for his late masters, and fully exploited by the carpet baggers,

“Cut such fantastic tricks before high Heaven
As made the angels weep.”

Finally, the prostrate South was roused to action and, by a determined effort, accompanied by much bloodshed and intimidation of the negro vote, threw off the hated domination of the Negro and the Carpetbagger. Her prosperity dates from that hour of agonized, determined struggle. Aiding, morally, in the supreme effort then made was that quite a large body of immigrants from the North who, to this day, vote for Democratic State and municipal tickets and give their suffrages to the Republican Presidential ticket. More Southern voters were children then, but they imbibed the bitterness of the hour from their parents.

Today the negroes feel, as one expressed it in a public meeting in this city (Jacksonville, Fla.), that they have paid off their debt to the Republican party. Yet the Democratic party, not needing their votes, does not woo them. It would, with many a wry face, perhaps, if it was deemed necessary to do so. They have, as a race, almost retired from political activity, here in Florida. They gained nothing by that activity in the days of Reconstruction; except the increased ill-will of their former masters. They dimly perceive this now. They were exploited by the Republicans as the capitalists exploit them now.

The Southerners seem to have, in a large measure, forgiven

those carpetbaggers who remained among them; but, it may be unconsciously, they still cherish animosity toward the poor instruments of the oppression of those days. Yet the habitual attitude of the better class of Southern men toward the negro is indulgent—except in politics. It is human nature to be unfor- giving to those who have been made use of to our injury while condoning the offense of the real injurer.

My friend, Dr. Cuzner, speaks of the degeneracy of the negro. Said a former slave to me, one day, while watching a gang of negroes I was overseeing, "This younger generation of negroes is thoroughly bad, they throng the police courts. You very seldom hear of an old slave being arrested. The negro was better off under slavery. It wasn't for his benefit, anyhow, that he was set free. The negro would not be a menace to good order at any time, except by petty offenses, if white men would leave him alone. When you hear of negroes rioting, you'll find some white man egging them on if you look deep enough. Why, do you suppose these black men would follow me if I tried to lead them into some devilment? Not for a minute. They'd say, 'G'way from here, nigger.' They won't even deal at stores kept by men of their race, if there is one kept by a white man almost as near. And white men can lead 'em every time."

Here is the opinion of a tolerably well educated ex-slave on his own race. Rather pessimistic, but based on a closer view than a white man can get. Here are exposed to view the roots of that contempt which, grafted into hereditary hatred, produces that foul growth race prejudice. A man of full moral status should be able to hold his head well above the reach of either. Yet men of Northern birth will express race prejudice, unconscious of the source of the infection.

Other elements, such as labor competition, etc., have weight, but my observation, confirmed by that of others, inclines me to the view here expressed.

There should be no difficulty in organizing negro locals, and he will work best in organizations of his own; despite his tendency to follow white leadership. He has a turn for organization, as his many benevolent societies ("The Seven Stars of Consolidation," "Heroines of Jericho," "Knights of Archery," and others of outlandish name) show. Probably a love for regalia and ritual have much to do with this. Colored workingmen seem to be easily united in trades unions of their own color and are, apparently, as loyal to their unions as their white brethren.

But they are not to be moved by the same arguments, in the same degree as the whites, it seems to me. It takes so little wealth to satisfy the average Southern negro. He is easily contented. But he feels his political isolation strongly and could with

little difficulty be won over to join the Socialist party if he could be made to feel that the party did not aim at his political exploitation, merely to desert him in the end, as he claims the Republican party has done. This indicates the direction his education in Socialism must take when it is begun. Once he understands the mission of the party, the ends and purposes of the movement, he will lose this childish distrust, of course.

The negro is conscious enough of race antagonism—he is constantly meeting with it. It is more difficult to arouse him to the feeling that he and the white workingman have one common interest and that great enough to swallow up any other based on race or color, if all workers would but study the actual relations in which they stand to the employing class.

More might be said of the characteristics of the negro, his emotional nature, his slim powers of reasoning, his imitativeness, his childlikeness (speaking of the race and not of individuals), but this is a study of the mental attitude of the average white man toward him, not of his race.

Once the Southerner becomes a thoroughly class-conscious Socialist his race prejudice drops from him. He perceives in his black brother another victim of capitalist exploitation; one who has a common interest with him in the struggle for the supremacy of the working class and that to leave him out in the cold would be an act of supreme folly; nay, will be impossible when the day for the reconstruction of society on a basis of true civilization comes. Some favor the segregation of the black race, but they will see in time that the proposition is impracticable and illogical.

But race prejudice must be counted on in trying to extend the Socialist propaganda among those whites who are not yet fully class-conscious, and especially among those ignorant ones Comrade Debs describes, when it is made plain to them that Socialism knows no racial limitations.

The conviction here expressed, that the feeling engendered by Reconstruction has much more to do with race prejudice than the mere fact that the negro was once a chattel, has forced itself on my mind during some years of residence in the far South. To fully appreciate the intensity of the resentment felt by the exploited whites in that period, one must live in the South awhile and talk over those dark days with white men who suffered and who took part in the final overthrow of negro domination. And some of these, to do them justice, recognize that the negro tools of the carpetbaggers were victims, in that day, of the ambition and greed of the men who used them, as they are today of their employers and the many usurers who fatten off them.

How to overcome this race prejudice is a problem to which I

am not prepared to offer a solution. There seems to be no necessity of forcing an issue. It will come soon enough, and then our speakers must be prepared to meet it and meet it frankly and courageously. My object in this paper is merely to present the situation as clearly as I am able as it appears to a dispassionate observer, and to offer some considerations to those who are better able to think out a solution.

OSCAR EDGAR.

The Backwardness of Socialism in Australia.

AN active, vigorous and intelligent proletariat is the first requisite for a socialist movement. Such a class does not as yet exist in Australia. The reason why all movements here have been simply reform movements can thus be readily understood. Economic conditions were not ripe for the formation of a class-conscious revolutionary party and it may even now be doubted whether industrial development is sufficiently advanced for the successful formation of an avowedly socialist political party.

I have thought it necessary for the thorough understanding of the position taken up, that a sketch of the economic development of Australia be given.

Australia was first settled in 1788 as a penal settlement. This early settlement is perhaps as good an example of state-socialism as history affords. Coghlan & Ewing in their book "The Progress of Australasia in the Century," p. 310, say: "The spirit of the Government was that of paternal interference in every concern of social life. For the individual, especially the laborer, everything was regulated. The Governor fixed the price and determined the quality of the provisions consumed in the settlement; he made grants of land, and, in order to beautify his metropolis, required those who received grants within its boundaries to build substantial and handsome houses thereon; he erected markets, and framed by-laws for their governance; he served out lands, cattle and provisions to his subjects like a tradesman purveying general merchandise." The convicts supplied the labor; they raised the crops, formed the roads, built the dwellings and in return received their food and the lash. Free immigrants were at first discouraged from settling in the colony. The Government was thus the sole employer of labor. Very soon, however, some of the military officers sought labor and they were supplied with a number of prisoners (the Government carrying their paternalism so far as to provide these laborers with food and clothing). When the sentences of some of the convicts expired there existed a class of free laborers whose numbers were augmented by retired soldiers and a few free immigrants who found their way to the colony. To provide regulations for this class a set of rules as stringent as the English Statute of Laborers was adopted. The governors for some time did not consider persons possessing less than £250 eligible for grants of land. When this disqualification was removed most of the free laborers then obtained

grants of land and a cry arose for additional labor. To meet this cry in 1831 a minimum price of 5 shillings an acre was charged for the land and the money thus raised was exclusively devoted to the purpose of supplying cheap free labor by means of immigration. The convicts still continued to be farmed out but the settlers complained of the inefficiency of this bond labor. The system of state-aided immigration was not successful in supplying free labor, as the cheapness of land defeated its purpose. A colonist named Wakefield, in a book published in 1829, complains bitterly of the hardships of the man of leisure in the colonies. "You cannot long have free servants in this country," he writes, "for, if a free man arrives in the colony, though he may for a short time work for you as a servant, yet he is sure to save a little money, and as land is here so excessively cheap, he at once becomes a landed proprietor. Thus, the colony is an excellent place for the poor man, but it is a wretched abode for the man of means and culture" (because of the impossibility of living by exploitation). Wakefield proposed to found in Australia another colony which should be better adapted "to those who had fortunes sufficient to maintain them and yet desired to emigrate. His scheme for effecting this comprised the fixing of a high price for the land. South Australia was founded under this scheme; there the price of land was fixed at £1 an acre. This scheme, of course, ended in dismal failure; but the advocates of the Wakefield scheme were powerful enough in 1843 to have the price of land throughout Australia raised to £1 an acre.

The system of state-aided immigration was recklessly pursued but the squatters and the farmers were unable to provide work for all the labor thus procured. The raising of the price of land and the oversupply of cheap labor made the farmer and the squatter economically the predominant factor. Conditions now existed which were creating a class of wage-workers who were entirely dependent on the squatter and the farmer for a livelihood. The lot of the worker was becoming so bad that time-expired convicts were paying their own passage to England at the same time that free laborers were being helped here. As yet, however, there was but little industrial development. Sheep and cattle-breeding, farming and timber-getting were the main occupations. In 1848, the industrial class numbered altogether 1,800 hands; there were 479 industrial establishments, of which 223 were flour mills, 62 tanneries and 51 breweries.

The discovery of gold at Bathurst and Ballarat in 1851 postponed for a while the economic dependence of the Australian worker. Marvelous tales of rich finds of gold reached the coastal settlements; everyone who could, set out with the idea

of making his fortune. Every branch of industry quickly became undermanned and some industries had to be altogether abandoned. Wages increased enormously but even then workmen could not be found. The wages in shillings for a few trades are given just prior to the gold-rush and when it was at its height.*

	1851.	1854.
Bricklayers	6s. 0d.	25s. to 30s.
Blacksmiths	6s. 8d.	20s. to 25s.
Carpenters	6s. 5d.	15s. to 20s.
Stovemakers	6s. 0d.	14s. to 22s.

The squatters became so alarmed at the scarcity of labor that they asked the Government to proclaim martial law and to prohibit all gold-digging in order that the industrial pursuits of the country should not be interfered with. As a partial concession to the squatters a license fee of 30 shillings a month was required from a person before he was allowed to seek for gold. The economic center of gravity, however, had now shifted. In 1853, £4,500,000 of gold was obtained and the gold-diggers held the key of the situation. The "squatocracy" of Victoria failed to realize this and at the instigation of this class the diggers' fee in that state was raised to £3 a month. The opposition to the imposition of this fee was so violent that a return was quickly made to the original sum. Even this in turn was, after the Eureka stockade, abolished and a yearly fee of 20 shillings charged for a miner's right.

This epoch was a very important one in the history of Australia and it has had lasting effects on the Australian workman. In 1861 the land laws were altered so as to allow the free selection of land and a system of deferred payments was introduced. This period of gold-rushes fostered a spirit of independence amongst the miners for, as most of the gold was alluvial or obtained at a slight depth below the surface, this class was not dependent on the caprices of a capitalist class. During this period the workers were enabled to obtain a larger number of the comforts of life than formerly fell to their lot. This fact has had a permanent effect in raising the standard of living of the workers.

The tales of fabulous riches to be acquired with little exertion brought a great influx of population to Australia. Numbers of these persons, unable to endure the hardships of a digger's life, returned to the coastal towns and in 1858 large numbers of unemployed existed both in Melbourne and Sydney. Although the land-laws were altered with the avowed purpose

*These figures are taken from "The Progress of Australasia in the Century," p. 367.

of giving facilities for all persons to go on the land, it affected the unemployed but little. A series of bad seasons followed the alteration of the land-laws and made it impossible for the non-capitalist farmer to succeed. Floods and droughts, alternated with vexatious regularity during this period. The flocks and herds of the squatters were visited with disease. Wages fell with a jump. In 1864, carpenters' wages ranged from 8s. to 9s; smiths', wheelwrights' and bricklayers' from 9s. to 10s. and masons were paid 10s.

Railway communication proceeded very slowly; only 1,135 miles were open for traffic in 1871. This was due, in part, to the difficulty the colonial treasurers had in obtaining money and also to the fact that the initial cost of construction was very great owing to the coastal range having to be crossed. This latter fact explains why private companies were not anxious to build railways.

In 1872 there was a revival in mining; communication was being extended by means of railways, bridges and roads. Agriculture expanded and cattle and sheep breeding prospered. All the available labor was employed; the unemployed disappeared and wages rose while provisions remained cheap. A vigorous immigration policy was pursued in order to keep the labor market supplied with material. In spite of this, however, carpenters' wages rose to 11s., bricklayers' to 12s. 6d., stone-masons' to 11s. 6d. and laborers' and navies' to 8s. The public works absorbed a large amount of labor and in 1885 New South Wales alone spent £5,242,807 on public works. An extensive system of public borrowing grew up and was necessitated by the fact that the states reserved to themselves the right to construct railways and similar undertakings. Private enterprise was not, at that time, anxious to construct railways as immediate profits were unlikely. The state undertook the work and as a result the public debt of Australia increased from £30,139,880 in 1871 to £155,177,773 in 1891. The interest on this amount seems a fairly high figure to pay for this measure of state socialism. A great boom was on; everything bore an inflated value. Speculation was rife and the gambling spirit vainly imagined it was creating wealth.

From 1886 the tide began to turn; the unemployed again made themselves prominent and wages began to fall. The change was gradual but certain; public borrowing ceased. Public works were stopped and in 1891 there was a great decline in the wages of unskilled labor. In 1893 the inevitable crisis occurred and an all round fall in wages was the result. In 1895, another drop in wages took place; the skilled workman receiving 22 per cent less than the wages of 1892 and unskilled labor 17½ per cent less.

When wages began to fall in 1886, the trades-unions made

vigorous efforts to arrest this tendency. The Newcastle miners struck in 1886 and 1887; the year 1890 is memorable as the year of the great shearers' strike and the seamen's strike, while the miners of Broken Hill were engaged in industrial warfare in 1892. The failure of these strikes taught the workers that, no matter how well organized labor is, it is powerless against organized capital. The recognition of this fact led to the formation of a parliamentary labor party who should aim at securing for the wage-earner a better return for his labor. In New South Wales the Labor Party contested the elections of 1891 and obtained 35 seats. Their manifesto contained electoral reform, a land tax, an eight-hour day, a factory act and other similar demands. Labor then entered an era of "practical politics"; socialism was rigidly excluded from the platform and the movement was thus rendered meaningless. It was eminently a class-movement but any class-consciousness which existed then has been successfully stifled by the leaders. In Queensland, however, about the same time, originated a movement which was both revolutionary and class-conscious. It was built up chiefly on sentimentalism and depended very little on economic knowledge. The reorganization of society was to be commenced at once and pursued uninterruptedly until social justice is fully secured to each and every citizen. It is hardly to be wondered at that a Labor Party, which was called into being by the sentimentalism of the early nineties, and was led by men entirely ignorant of the nature of the capitalist state, should have gradually degenerated into a mere reform party whose main desire is to attain office. In the July number of *The Social-Democrat* of London Comrade Eyre deals more fully with the labor movements of Australia and clearly points out their utter futility.

The reason for these failures is, without a doubt, the absence of a large industrial proletariat. In 1895 there were but 8,247 manufacturing establishments with 133,631 hands. Since then more attention has been given to manufacture and in 1901 there were 10,559 manufacturing establishments with 193,037 hands.

The following figures (taken from Coghlan's "Seven Colonies of Australasia") will give some idea of the state of economic development existing here in 1901. The figures here given, as elsewhere in this article, are exclusive of New Zealand:

<i>Class of Industry—</i>	<i>Amount of Production.</i>
Agriculture	£23,835,000
Pastoral	27,150,000
Dairying, poultry raising and bee farming.....	9,740,000
Mining	22,016,000
Forestry and fisheries.....	2,772,000
Manufactories	27,191,000
Total production.....	£112,704,000

Although Victoria was the first state to display activity in manufacture, New South Wales has, of late years, made the most progress in this direction. It is worthy of note that during the ten years (1891-1901) in New South Wales labor's share in the value added during the process of manufacture has decreased from 52 per cent to 49 per cent. In that state there has been an increase of 69.05 per cent in the value of the material used; in the value of the fuel 15.08 per cent; in the value of wages 15.69 per cent and in the value added during the process of manufacture there has been an increase of 22.9 per cent. The value of profits, interests and rents has thus increased 30.7 per cent. The exact figures as given by Coghlan may prove interesting.

	1891.	1901.
Value of materials treated.....	£ 8,172,383	£13,815,000
Value of fuel used.....	431,543	496,615
Value of wages paid.....	4,272,704	4,943,079
Value of total output.....	16,807,132	24,393,471
Value added during process of manufacture	8,203,206	10,081,756

From this it can be seen that capital's share increased from £3,930,502 in 1891 to £5,138,677 in 1901.

These figures point to a development in the manufactures of New South Wales which is due to the more extensive use of machinery and the employment of machinery of a better class.

The figures for Australia as a whole are given for 1901, although the data appears to be insufficient.

Materials treated.....	£35,888,000
Fuel used.....	1,177,000
Wages paid.....	14,706,000
Profits, rent, insurance, etc.....	12,485,000
Total value.....	£64,256,000

This would give the rate of surplus value for Australia as a whole at 85 per cent, but it is very probable that a great increase will take place shortly. The inter-state tariffs have had something to do with hampering the extension of manufacture. The advent of federation has broken down these barriers and manufacturing firms are beginning to concentrate in the most suitable places.

The division of the bread-winners of Australia into the three classes of employers, those engaged on their own account and other workers (i. e., employees) is instructive.

The following figures refer to the year 1891 (the figures for 1901 on this point not being obtainable). These figures are exclusive of Queensland:

<i>Class—</i>	<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
Employers	116,205	7,283	123,488
Engaged on their own account.....	127,929	32,698	160,627
Other workers.....	693,124	183,568	876,692

Of late years the great mad rush for wealth has abandoned the speculative mania for the more steady and certain method of developing the resources of the country. Australia can already boast of big undertakings. The Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme is one of the largest ventures of its kind. Water is brought to Coolgardie from a reservoir on the Helena River (325 miles distant) and a daily supply of 5,000,000 gallons of fresh water is insured. Schemes of a similar nature are necessities in a dry and riverless territory like the interior of Australia. Colossal pumps with a capacity of 114,000 gallons per hour are now manufactured in Melbourne. There were 1,263 Ferrier's lever wool-presses made and disposed of in Australia during 1901. Worthington pumps, new dry air ammonia refrigerating machinery and patent steel windmills are now being manufactured locally.

The opening up of the coal and iron deposits of Australia will give a great impetus to local manufacture. For some time past it has been known that workable iron ore in large quantities exists in close proximity to coal deposits. It has been alleged that pig-iron can be produced much more cheaply here than in America or England. Federal legislation is intending to aid the development of the iron industry either by granting bonuses to private producers or by encouraging the states to work them on their own initiative. Attempts are also being made to introduce the manufacture of rubber and the growing of cotton into Queensland.

It will thus be seen that the near future holds great possibilities of rapid economic development. These changes will be the means of forming a proletariat who will become the backbone of the Australian revolutionary movement.

The waste of competition has already been recognized and the effects of this evil have been minimized by combination and concentration. The coastal steamship companies have entered into an agreement not to cut the fares and freights. The Traders' Association of Brisbane are making an effort to prevent traders from selling below cost price. The timber merchants are combining to regulate the price of timber.

The process of concentration is noticeable in Queensland sugar mills:

Year.	Number of Miles.	Tons of Sugar produced.	Gallons of Molasses produced.
1884-1885	166	32,010	804,613
1885-1886	166	59,225	1,784,266
1886-1887	100	56,859	1,510,308
1899-1900	58	123,289	3,092,571
1900-1901	58	92,554	3,534,832
1901-1902	52	120,858	3,679,952

(These figures are taken from the Year Book of Australia, 1903; the sugar season begins about July.*) The meat industry also would seem to have eliminated competition from the trade. The Queensland Meat Export & Agency Company, Limited, during the year ending 30th November, 1902, made a net profit of £60,425 on a paid-up capital of £109,519.

Hitherto the strength of the labor movement in Australia has been drawn from the pastoral workers and the miners. From this latter class no support of revolutionary socialism can yet be expected. The existence of alluvial deposits of easily workable reefs give the gold digger a sort of semi-independence. His chief desire is to obtain the right to mine on private property. Shallow reefs and alluvial deposits are beginning to disappear and the miners, like the other classes, are now being forced into the position of economic dependents. In order to ensure employment for his class, he is demanding that the partial closing down of mines, under the exemption clauses of the mining acts, be reduced to a minimum. (A certain number of men must be employed by the holder of a mining lease; the number varies according to the extent of the lease. It is, however, very easy to obtain exemption from these labor conditions.)

The shearer, who, being confined to the interior, is denied the few attractions of his town brothers, is demanding better accommodation while shearing and a little extra pay. The shop assistants are anxious for a shorter working day. The laborers in our sugar districts, dreading unemployment, are anxious to prevent the employment of colored labor. Each section has some one "immediate demand" in which the other sections are not directly interested. Compulsory conciliation and arbitration—the most short-sighted demand of all—receives the support of all sections, and there is every reason to imagine that it will be granted by the next Federal parliament as well as by the individual states who have not yet granted it. Nowhere is there an earnest demand for a real change of conditions. We Anglo-Saxons are too wise for that; we must have something practical. As a result of this the Queensland labor platform has been modified into a contrivance

*The sugar year thus starts in July and ends in the following June.

for catching votes quickly. The Labor Party, now allied with a number of farmers' representatives, are showing great anxiety to erect storage sheds for wheat and to buy surplus products (as cape-gooseberries and pineapples) and to find a market for them. Some of our friends see in these measures a great victory for socialism.

Labor members of parliament, who, in the early years of the movement, thought it necessary to devote themselves largely to propaganda work, have now become too respectable to perform the duties of an agitator. They are not now a propagandist party (a direct result of the mania for practical politics), but are a mere political party whose avowed object is to get into power. Such an object has of course naturally led to compromise and a sacrifice of principles. Indeed, the guiding principle of most of them is looking after their own interests. The real object of the world-wide labor movement is never alluded to except in obscure places and in vague terms.

Within the last few years there have sprung up in all the state capitals (except Tasmania) socialist parties who have endeavored to permeate the Labor Party with socialistic ideals. With the exception of the two Sydney organizations, these organizations are essentially Fabian and are founded chiefly on sentimentalism. They are thoroughly imbued with the idea of gradually extending the collectivist principle.

The idea seems to be prevalent that, with the aid of legislation, economic development can be so guided and directed that the misery and suffering attendant on intense development will be avoided. A large amount of time and energy is wasted in trying to hamper and restrict economic development. Utopianism exists to a large extent and a great deal of faith is placed on co-operative colonies.

Hitherto, then, the nature of the class-warfare has been obscured both by the lack of economic development and by the labor movement itself. The prevalence of floods and droughts has also done much in this direction. The sight of the bleached bones of cattle and sheep done to death by the parched and arid state of the country has led the worker to imagine that he was engaged in a struggle with nature.

The nature of the class-struggle is, however, being more clearly seen and signs are not wanting that Australia will shortly add a strong and powerful phalanx to the international army who are marching to world-conquest.

ANDREW M. ANDERSON.

“The American Farmer.”*

BUILDERS need building material, and it is certainly a socially-useful occupation to make bricks, shape stones, prepare mortar, etc., etc. But the work of the architect, who combines the bricks, stones, etc., into the shape of a noble edifice, is of a higher degree of social usefulness than mere brick making, stone cutting, etc.

In the dominion of thought and knowledge there are hosts of useful workers who diligently engage themselves in ascertaining, collecting, stating and classifying facts, observing phenomena, experimenting—in short, in preparing the building material, the bricks, stones and mortar for the noble edifice of Philosophy and Science.

Now and then a thinker and scientist with an architectonic mind rearranges, shifts and recombines the raw materials of thought and knowledge of his age into a great system, into a grand artistic whole and creates an epoch in the history of the development of the human mind.

Ordinary workers in the field of science, as a rule, are apt to short-sightedness, to exaggeration of the importance of some small special branch of knowledge and to undervaluation of general, broad and deep, truly philosophic conceptions.

Thinkers and scientists of the architectonic mind-type usually meet with the most violent opposition on the part of the ordinary workers of professional science. It takes a long time till the broad generalizations of a master-mind are accepted by the rank and file of professional scientists and the general public. However, the struggle against the acceptance and recognition of a grand idea is preferable to its misconception and dogmatization by uncritical minds of adherers.

Rodbertus, Marx and Lassalle were the architectonic master-minds who shifted, rearranged and recombined the raw materials of social-economic thought and knowledge of their age into a great system of constructive and critical modern Socialism, into a grand philosophy of human life, and created an epoch in the history of the development of the human mind. The ideas and ideals of these master-minds met with the most violent opposition on the part of the professional scientists, the so-called vulgar economists and sociologists of the Spencerian school. This opposition is still very strong because it is backed up by the exclusive interests of the ruling middle class. However, this struggle against the ac-

*The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons, editor of the International Socialist Review, Chicago. Charles H. Kerr & Co.

ceptance and recognition of the grand idea of evolutionary socialism seems to us preferable to its misconception and dogmatization by the uncritical minds of the avowed followers of Marx's and Lassalle's teachings. Where there is life there is strife between conflicting interests, or rather between the representatives of conflicting interests; and where there is a struggle there is hope to win and conquer. But the dogmatization of an idea (or a cycle of ideas) is identical with the ossification of living tissue, with petrification, with spiritual death. Soon after the death of Lassalle and Marx the Socialist movement somehow lost the vivifying vigor of critical thinking. This was a time when the mental equipment of a Socialist of the rank and file consisted in a few ill (if at all) digested and parrot-like repeated shibboleths and maxims, borrowed on credit from some of the fathers and prominent leaders of the movement. These shibboleths and maxims were regarded somewhat in the same light as texts of the Bible by church people. For doubt, criticism and original thought there did not seem to be any demand among socialists. Orthodoxy and dogmatism of the most rigid pattern were considered as essential qualities of a true socialist. Anybody who dared to think for himself and have his own ideas was considered either a fool or a knave, or, more frequently, a fool and knave at once. Intolerance and heresy-hunting were the natural consequences of narrowness of mind. Some of these old-time Socialists were, to use the picturesque slang of David Harum, "so narrer in their views that fourteen of 'em e'n sit, side an' side, in a buggy." It was the golden age of self-appointed small imitators of the great Lassalle, of Socialistic popes, of innumerable arrogant and ignorant bosses who tried to run the whole thing, while the rank and file said "Yes" and "Amen" to any antique capers of their "scientific" leaders. Under such conditions the Socialist movement, instead of progressing, spreading and deepening, was moving backward, getting more and more shallow, was arousing more prejudices against its doctrines. It was a time of petty personal quarrels and mutual abuse in choicest billingsgate among jealous so-called "leaders," a time of useless hair-splitting and flagrant sectarianism.

Fortunately this transitional period is rapidly passing away and rational, truly philosophical evolutionary Socialism is broadening and deepening with every day, sending its roots into the national soil, and spreading its vigorous branches beyond the limits of one small class.

The old-time Socialists refused to take interest in the fate of the man with the hoe, the farmer. The narrow mind of fanatics always moves in abstractions and ignores life and its lessons. To the orthodox socialist a proletarian is not essentially a living human being capable of reasoning, feeling and acting, but a cer-

tain economic category. The farmer was not considered as belonging to that category once he even only nominally owned a patch of arid soil and a few implements not worth more than scrap-iron. To try to take the farmer into the Socialist movement would be a mortal sin against the fetish of "class-consciousness."

In view of these facts and considerations the appearance of a book like the "American Farmer" from the authoritative pen of the editor of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, Mr. A. M. Simons, ought to be hailed with delight by all those who value human life and its interests higher than dead dogmas and irrational creeds. The book is written in the fluent style of a professional journalist, its language is singularly free from the hackneyed pseudo-scientific brogue peculiar to the literary hash prepared in certain socialistic kitchens, where cheapness is the main consideration and quality does not count. Mr. A. M. Simons succeeded in digesting a great deal of original investigation into a handy volume, representing at once a lucid and comprehensive treatise of the subject.

The book is divided into three parts and sixteen separate chapters. The first part of the book is devoted to the history of the development of the class of farmers in the New England States, in the South, in the middle and far West, and in the arid belt.

The second book discusses with considerable erudition agricultural economics. The movement toward the city; the modern farmer; the transformation of agriculture; the concentration of agriculture, and the farmer and the wage-worker are the main topics treated in that part of the book. The last part argues about the coming change, about the line of future evolution, the Socialist movement, Socialism and the farmer, and steps towards the realization of the ideal state of society.

This enumeration of the subjects treated in the book may give an idea about the scope of Mr. A. M. Simons' work.

The author displays a great deal of wisdom in the guarded conclusions he arrived at. The main points of these conclusions are the following:

I. The small farmer is a permanent factor in the agricultural life of the United States of America and forms the largest undivided division of the producing class.

II. Any movement which seeks to work either with or for the producing class must take cognizance of the farmer class.

III. The isolation and disorganization of the class of farmers makes it impossible for it to take the initiative in any national social-economic movement.

IV. *In order to successfully meet the encroachment of the exploiting class, the class of farmers must do it through co-opera-*

tion with the better organized and more homogeneous body of the working class composed of urban wage workers.

The last conclusion is the key of the reviewed treatise and logically follows from the first two conclusions.

"It is only through a close political union of the entire laboring class upon a programme in accord with social evolution that anything lasting and effective can be done to better the condition of the workers either of farm or factory. Until this fact is realized both are destined to remain in a greater or less degree of servitude to those who are the industrial and political rulers of present society," says Mr. A. M. Simons on page 214 of his new book. "If this book shall have added even the slightest degree to the formation of such a political union and ultimate emancipation it will have accomplished its purpose," are the closing words of the work (*ib idem*).

"The manner of exploitation of the industrial wage-worker of the mines and factory and that of the farmer is practically the same. Both stand as a class opposed to the exploiting class, neither owns the essentials of production which are necessary to the class of producers. Under these conditions their position is shoulder to shoulder in a common battle for a common freedom. The farmer must enter the political battle from the point of view of the laborer, not of the capitalist. In the two great armies into which modern society is divided his place is with the creators of wealth in mine and shop and factory" (p. 138).

"These quotations will suffice to show the general trend of the book, representing an eloquent and convincing plea for united political action on the part of all producers against the parasitic classes of society.

Some definitions used by the author deserve especial attention. For instance, the definition of concentration reads as follows:

"A movement tending to give a continually diminishing minority of the persons engaged in any industry a constantly increasing control over the essentials and a continually increasing share of the total value of the returns of the industry."

We would take exception to the analogy between human society and a jelly-fish. Spencer and his school have a distinct purpose in view, when advancing the organic theory of society. They want to intimate that social growth and development is a purely organic, unconscious and slow process. This theory is eminently in the interest of the conservative ruling classes of society. *Socialism is conscious social evolution.* The middle class sociologists preach that society ought to be left alone to work out its salvation in æons of time necessary for *natural organic* development. Spencer approaches society from the static point of view. Socialist thinkers approach society from the dynamic point of view and insist on stimulating and accelerating social develop-

ment by the infusion of consciousness into the social life and activity. If the organic theory is true Socialists are only wasting their energies when trying to propagate their ideas and ideals. Fortunately the middle-class theory of society cannot stand the test of logic and scientific criticism and Socialists would do well to avoid the organic analogies, which are wrong and confusing to the extreme.

Summing up the impression produced by the "*American Farmer*" we feel like recommending it to every thoughtful student of society. We hope that this work will be followed up by a series of similar treatises, which throw more light on real social-economic problems than a dozen of dogmatic articles on "class-struggle" and similar hackneyed subjects. We may conclude with Goethe's immortal lines: *Grau ist alle Theorie, grün sind des Lebens Zweige*. We socialists need most actual knowledge of existing social-economic conditions. The official reports issued periodically by the various departments of the government of the United States, inadequate and unreliable as they may be in some respects, contain an inexhaustible mine of useful information about the existing social-economic conditions. Socialist writers need only to arrange and combine the raw material of official statistics in the light of modern science and philosophy in order to produce the most effective means of propaganda of the ideas and ideals of conscious social evolution or socialism.

ISADOR LADOFF.

A History of German Trade Unions.

(Continued from January issue.)

CHAPTER III.

1878—1895.

TRIALS AND PREPARATIONS.

ON the 11th of May, 1878, Hoedel, and on the 2d of June, Noebeling, two cranks, shot at the old Emperor. Bismarck declared that these fools were Socialists, and ended by securing from the Reichstag, especially elected for this purpose, the laws of exception against the Socialists. To the police were given the task of muzzling the press, dissolving organizations and suppressing the right of assemblage (October 21). The propagandists were expelled and the great cities put in a state of siege. The capitalists even took a hand in this work: the employers compelled their laborers to sign a refutation of all subversive ideas and drove the suspects out of the shop.

This alone would have been enough to ruin the unions. Their most active members were removed, banished, or imprisoned. But the law went even further. The police had the duty of forbidding associations of all kinds which by social-democratic, socialist or communistic methods sought to overthrow the state and present society. They did not fail to act. Between the 23rd of October and the 31st of December, 1878, sixteen of the twenty-five unions listed by Geib were dissolved. The others were threatened, and some, like the printers, suppressed themselves. Only four seem to have lived until 1883.

During this white terror even the Hirsch-Duncker unions were anxious. They had carefully protected themselves against the invasion of the Socialists by passing, in 1876, the famous resolution by which each new member was required to take an oath that he did not belong to the Social-Democratic party. Many times their councillor was involved in troubles with the authorities, and their circulars constantly enjoined prudence. It was said that Bismarck intended to crush out all organization of the laborers.

He might as well have attempted to annihilate the whole system of capitalist industry. The formidable machine of the Prussian police was able in three years to reduce the Socialist vote by 100,000; it harassed political propaganda for ten years. Against those who were compelled by necessity to defend their daily bread, it accomplished almost nothing. From 1880 on, when the eco-

nomic situation became a little better, in spite of everything, the laboring class began again its work of trade organization.

The laws had scarcely been promulgated and the societies dissolved when the laborers began once more to unite. This was first done as subscribers to the same journals; little trade leaflets, without politics, which began to arise. By the end of 1878 the trade journal of the shoemakers reappeared. In 1879 that of the woodworkers, and of the carpenters at Hamburg, and the tobacco workers of Leipsic, etc., were revived. These journals were a means of awakening and of union. In case of strike they received the funds and pointed out the opportunities for employment. They were even able with some caution to discuss the laws—at least, all those of interest to the working class. The spirit of solidarity was maintained, and the ranks remained unbroken.

The free benefit associations, founded under the law of 1876, furnished another opportunity which was not neglected. Some of the central organizations of the sick and death benefit associations founded by the Socialists had been dissolved, but, because they were according to the law itself, independent of the unions, others continued to exist. And the propagandists continued to push out among the workers.

Some of these in the beginning at the time of the worst oppression were very bold. Under the disguise of benefit funds they reorganized their unions. The printers were the first to do this, but their attitude of neutrality and the slightly aggressive attitude towards the Socialist leaders was not sufficient to reassure the government, and they were compelled to dissolve in order to save their funds. In November, 1878, they founded a Society of Mutual Assistance, and, as the Saxon authorities refused their authorization, they located their headquarters at Stuttgart. The hatters, who were dissolved in 1879, cautiously followed their example, and established in May, 1880, as a sub-division of their Central Sick and Death Benefit Fund, a society for mutual assistance, which was nothing more than a trade union. With the same prudence, as the result of a strike in Berlin, the woodcarvers of Germany formed a society for mutual assistance, which flourished in spite of the authorities, who were urged on by the rival Hirsch-Duncker union. Thus it came about that during the two years of the most brutal and thorough application of the Socialist laws, labor organizations were well maintained.

In 1880 German industry, which had languished since the crisis of 1874, revived; only about forty corporations had been founded each year during this period. In 1880 there was a sudden increase to ninety-seven, with a capitalization of \$21,850,000; in 1881, 111, with \$47,310,000. The natural consequence followed—a widespread strike movement. The woodworkers of Germany

led the first of these, a rather unimportant one, in the spring of 1880. The close of this same year saw the revival of the isolated trade organizations.

Moreover, the political situation now favored a revival of organization. Bismarck had reported that force alone was not sufficient to detach people from the agitators in whom they had trusted; the working class loyalty which he desired to obtain failed to materialize. The policy of the lash gave way to that of sugar-plums. Violence was replaced with corruption. Bismarck declared that in order to cure the ills of society "it is necessary to better the conditions of the laborers by bona fide gifts." Thereupon came the famous imperial message of November 17, 1881, in which the Prussian government recognized the right of the workers to have work when capable, the right to care when sick, the right to bread when aged or infirm. Again the celebrated insurance legislation against sickness in June, 1883; accident in July, 1884; disability and old age in June, 1889, constituted an administrative work inaugurated, without doubt, wholly for political reasons, but which constituted, nevertheless, a revolutionary step for the trade union and socialist movement.

Even in this hour of first solemn declarations wholly unlooked-for results began to appear in the shape of a free labor movement in full publicity. This could not occur without some outside initiative, and these laws furnished this in a most remarkable manner.

Bismarck needed at least a semblance of working class collaboration with which to play, and he was using all his arts to gain the masses. Pastor Stöcker, the old Court preacher, who had started the Christian Socialist movement in 1877, bolder and freer in every way than the busy politician, was just as certainly following the same plan of conciliation, when in 1881 he attempted to create a certain sort of public opinion within the working class.

But it so happened that on the day on which Bismarck had expected to receive from the lips of the workers their complaints and their vows of allegiance, he found his invitation accepted by the Berlin *gilder*, Ewald. In March, 1882, Bismarck had called together the heads of the trade associations of Berlin, and a committee of seven members was appointed on which it was skillfully arranged to have two Christian Socialists. Then, in order to discuss the address of the Chancellor, numerous meetings were held, which were generally confused and enthusiastic, but where the Christian Socialist speakers were followed by those old Socialist leaders, Hasenclever and Fröhme. This idyllic condition lasted for some months, during the first part of 1883, and while Stöcker's project of compulsory unions was being discussed. But the workers showed no desire to be controlled with military discipline, according to their pass-books* (*livret*). They said as

*German laborers are required to carry a book endorsed by their last employer and the police, giving various items of personal information.

much in these new assemblages, where Stöcker was finally hooted, and when Ewald praised Lassalle as the only friend of the workers. Then the police interfered; Ewald was condemned.

But important results had already been accomplished. The government was henceforth unable to so openly confuse Socialism and unionism. Moreover, the trade organizations began to grow. In Berlin alone eighteen responded to the first call of Ewald; and now, by the middle of 1883, these had increased to fifty. The first impulse had been given and the movement continued unchecked.

* * *

During this renaissance diverse tendencies were manifested. This was partly due to the fact that the working class were compelled to make use of many different methods in order to group themselves anew, and it was also partly due to the fact that five years of oppression had not sufficed to completely efface the divergencies and to unify the various ideas concerning the union movement. Finally, it may be generally stated, that those who suffered in the conflict between immediate interests and political convictions necessarily hesitated. In consequence the unions were made to serve either the interests or the convictions, according to circumstances.

In the first place, as a result of some provisions of the law, the benefit funds developed immensely. The law of 1883 on insurance against sickness recognized the benefit side of the unions and exempted their members from the compulsory insurance law. The union benefit funds had several advantages over the compulsory ones established by law; they had the right to self-government without official intervention; they furnished relief directly in cash and did not require the acceptance of the services of any particular physician; they were better organized nationally, thus assuring assistance to their members wherever they might be, and as a consequence the laborers joined them *en masse*. At one congress of these benefit associations (mostly Socialists), held at Gera in 1886, there were 419,159 members represented, of whom 249,741 belonged to twenty-six central associations. The woodworkers alone had 72,000 members, and the metal workers 32,842. But this situation helped the Hirsch-Duncker unions also, who had otherwise grown slowly with their anti-socialist tactics. They confined their activity to institutions for mutual benefit. In addition to their sick benefit fund, they gradually introduced, after 1879, aid for the unemployed. All this attracted members, and between 1878 and 1885 they grew from 16,500 members to 51,000.

But while these funds offered immediate and definite advantages and assisted in drawing the workers together, they were

still far from satisfactory to those who had the most full and clear comprehension of the union movement. In order to keep up benefit funds with their high dues, good wages are necessary; these can be obtained only through strikes, and successful strikes, and for successful strikes fighting organizations are necessary. But what is a strike but a class struggle? And, although according to the Socialist law, the German Code by its provision of the right of coalition still recognized legal defense as a right, the police were authorized to arm themselves in advance for all such combats.

The workers resorted to loose organizations. In many cities when there was a strike a general assembly of the trade was called, which voted the strike and appointed a committee to direct it. This differed from the union in that it was a temporary organization, continuing only during the strike. Sometimes, however, in order to close up matters and dispose of any money which remained, committees continued to exist after the struggle was over. Naturally, the idea soon arose of permanent committees, to which the general assemblages would give repeated authority for definite purposes. From city to city, as occasions arose, these committees were able to extend. Finally Kressler, an architect, studied out a complete plan of organization founded on these customs.

This was, so to speak, the new form in which reappeared the old localist spirit and the political circumstances gave it this time a remarkable strength. The Socialist party being forcibly disorganized, its propagandists exiled, or imprisoned, its meetings forbidden, the unions, only half tolerated by the government, appeared as suitable organizations for the extension of the Socialist idea, and among the unions, these floating organizations especially, without a fixed treasury, with no permanent connection with each other, took up the political battle, like true guerrillas of the social struggle. At Berlin, in Saxony, the great Socialist center, these organizations multiplied, and even co-operated to some degree by means of confidential agents (*Vertrauensmänner*). The unions actually became, as Schweitzer had wished in 1868, the Socialist school of the laboring class. Nothing is really more educative than a well-conducted, well-explained wage struggle. This is why Liebknecht in 1884 preached the necessity of laborers belonging to the unions, and the necessity of neutrality to the unions.

But, in order to thus take part in the struggle and in order to influence legislation—in short, in order to act politically—it became necessary to turn over the immediate benefits of organization to insurance societies and to renounce the advantage of a fixed treasury in case of strike; since, as we have seen, the po-

litical societies did not have the right of federation. Some resigned themselves regretfully to dispersed activity. But, in spite of continuous betrayal and the enormous difficulty of maintaining a national union under the existing regime which should be well prepared for strikes and for assistance, nevertheless, when once it was decided that this was the proper road, they set themselves to work.

Under various forms, the printers, carpenters and wood-carvers had already formed national unions, but they lived a very subdued life, in half concealment.

In 1883, under the cover of the mummeries of the Middle Ages, such as banners, military music, "*Hoch*, the Emperor," etc., the carpenter Marzian, a well-known agitator, succeeded for the first time in forming a union of his trade. His position was false; the members of the union were mostly Socialists; the firm purpose of Marzian to dispense with all agitation, avoid strikes and devote all energies to "practical duties" destroyed the hopes that had been secretly held, and led to quarrels and the overthrow of the founder.

Then it was that one bravely dared and attempted something more; as the result of the strike at Stuttgart, the well-known propagandist and avowed Socialist, Kloss, without attempting to conceal his object, organized a true union for striking and mutual assistance; that of the woodworkers at Noel in 1883. He conceded much independence to local groups, but for the whole organization there was a central union having definite authority and with its treasury supported by dues. Statistics of the labor market, traveling assistance, employment agencies, in short, all the instruments required for the union struggle, were fully created.

In spite of embarrassments of all sorts, through which the untiring energy of Kloss was maintained, the union continued to live. This great union established without fear of the anti-Socialist laws, paying no attention to the conditions imposed by the laws of association, and nevertheless tolerated by the Wurttemberg police, was a splendid example. To those who expressed their fears Kloss replied that legally his position was strong; the right of coalition was unassailable, and so also, as a consequence, was a union founded upon that right. Kloss was right. Here was the weak point. The Imperial Government could not very well be always proclaiming its solicitude for the workers and at the same time suppressing their most vital right. It attempted this, however, in 1886."

* * *

Towards the end of 1885 there came a sudden acceleration in economic development. This was characteristic of the years from 1880 to 1890—a general industrial stagnation with here and there

some transient flashes of prosperity. This time the long, obstinate and energetically conducted strikes which broke out thoroughly demonstrated the progress of organization and union spirit. A clear class-consciousness on the part of the capitalist denounced the Socialist influence, and the police estimated that more than 100,000 of the organized workers in the unions had this tendency. The strikes seemed to them to be a menace to society.

Then it was that the Pommeranian Puttkamer, whom Bismarck had called to the control of internal affairs, pointed out the duties of the police in his decrees of April 11, 1886. He showed how it was possible to distinguish between an economic strike and a revolutionary strike, between an authorized strike and a Socialist strike; the latter must be punished at once as soon as it could be identified as such. The method was not new; the judges of Louis Philippe had formerly distinguished in the same manner republican strikes and ordinary strikes. But the French had at least not pretended to grant the right of coalition.

It might be well to say here just what it was that they sought to suppress; in the majority of the strikes, Socialists were active, and the expressions against the capitalists were frequent and sharp. But the decree stopped nothing; it is even possible that it did good; but the police took to their credit the inevitable failure of a few strikes.

From every point of view, chicanery, persecutions, and discouraging annoyances rendered this period almost unendurable. It was during this time that all the paragraphs of the laws of association were used against the unions; against the great unions the laws concerning political societies were invoked, while the local unions were prosecuted as insurance societies.

Even the benefit funds did not escape persecution. As their competition began to be felt by the governmental associations, these latter entered upon a campaign of legal processes against them founded upon an ambiguous paragraph in the law of 1883, and during the years 1887 to 1890 the judges generally decided in favor of the official societies.

Such measures as these were scarcely calculated to assist in the organization of the workers. Election after election the Socialist vote increased. In 1884 it was 550,000; in 1887, 763,000; in 1890, 1,427,000. All obstacles helped to rouse the spirit of solidarity, and in 1889, when prosperity unexpectedly returned, strikes again broke out everywhere.

One strike in particular, that of the miners, had a tremendous and far-reaching effect. In this trade, which was still deeply religious, and which, owing to an old system of benefit funds (*Knappschaften*), was subject to a sort of guardianship by the employers of the state, the strike grew to enormous proportions

with the formidable rapidity accompanying the primitive uprising of an oppressed people. The "politicians" were helpless. The purely economic demands were for an increase of from 15 to 25 per cent in wages and an eight-hour day. By the 14th of May 100,000 miners were on strike in Westphalia. In the other valleys, those of the Saar, of Saxony and Silesia, the comrades stopped work by the thousand as individuals.

It was the young Emperor William II. who finally stopped the strike. On the advice of Hinzpeter, his old teacher, he received the delegates of the laborers. He told them of his hatred of the social democracy, but assured them of his desire to render justice to every one. He obtained some concessions from the employers, and work began again. The Westphalian miners thanked the Emperor, and then founded a union which was soon dominated by Socialist ideas.

It now became evident that neither brutality nor trickery were effective against the labor movement. A new policy was therefore necessary. Even during the life of Frederick III., Herrforth had replaced Puttkammer, and was showing himself more tolerant towards the unions. By his February decree William II. formulated the new policy of the state. This included the development of insurance and factory legislation, to which Bismarck had set the most narrow limits, and "the right of laborers to legal equality before the law." In March, 1890, the anti-Socialist law was not renewed. The time of trial had passed.

* * *

What were some of the results of twelve years of Bismarckian policy? The party he sought to crush had grown and acquired solidarity and the spirit of sacrifice by the struggle. The unions he had hoped to annihilate as the altars of the revolution were reorganized more numerous than ever before, and with a knowledge of the laws and tactical skill necessary to baffle all the numerous tricks of the police. The 50,000 workers organized in Socialist unions in 1878 had increased to 350,000 in 1890. Forty-one union journals, with 201,000 subscribers, had replaced the fourteen publications suppressed in 1878.

The Hirsch-Duncker unions had also grown alongside the Socialists. They had increased from 16,500 members in 1878 to 63,000 in 1891, but when it is remembered that their mutual assistance features had been added during this time, and that they had enjoyed uninterrupted peace during these twelve years of insecurity for all others, the result seems very small.

There was one thing, at least, that Bismarck had finally obtained, and that was the henceforth indissoluble union in the minds of the majority of the workers of all effort for labor and the idea of Socialism. Bismarck had finally brought to a realization the old Schweitzerian idea of 1868. Persecution had finally

united political and union activity, and in 1890 they found themselves firmly connected, even identified.

* * *

This complete amalgamation, however, was not without danger for the growth of the union movement. During the existence of the laws of exception the unions had become the essential means of propaganda and association. Under the pretext of labor legislation, they began to take part in political affairs. In 1890 it once more became possible for the Socialists to have a political life and form political societies. But according to the law of association, political societies were not permitted to federate or unite with each other.

But economic necessities, assistance during strike and the mutual benefit institutions, rendered some sort of union between the various societies absolutely essential. This, then, was the problem, a problem of organization: was it better to form great centralized unions and give up political activity, or to remain isolated, holding no communication even with the party except through confidential agents (*Vertrauensmänner*), and thereby give up the assured advantages of a central union?

This question roused once more the old opposition between Localists and Centralists: one side wished to continue the Socialist propaganda; the others, also confirmed Socialists and devoted members of the political party, looked upon the unions only as a means of developing the economic power, and the capacity for resistance (*Widerstandsfähigkeit*) of the proletariat. It is to the honor of the German working class that from the time of York to the present members of the General Committee, under all circumstances, there have always been militants who have held clear and proper ideas of the relation between trade union work and political activity. From 1890 to 1896, in the midst of an economic crisis and in spite of fierce opposition, they victoriously defended their position, and thereby decided the future of German unionism.

Indeed, the unions had scarcely felt the first breath of freedom before some of them were planning to join their forces in a central organization. A conference of seventy-seven union presidents and secretaries, held at Berlin November 16, 1890, established a general commission, located at Hamburg, having the duty of calling a congress and preparing a plan of central organization, and meanwhile defending the right of coalition, supporting the isolated organizations in their struggle and extending the system of organization among the poorer trades and into the more backward portions of the country. A tax, which was poorly paid, of one pfennig per quarter, was inadequate to permit the complete fulfillment of these great duties, and in order

to sustain a strike of the tobacco workers of Hamburg it became necessary to borrow nearly \$25,000.

The first congress of German unions was held at Halberstadt on March 14, 1892. Two hundred and eight delegates were present, representing 303,519 laborers. Kloss, the founder of the woodworkers' union, and Legien, a Hamburg turner, presided.

Here it was that the quarrel broke out when the committee submitted its plan of organization. It proposed to take the unions, now separated according to trade, and group them into great branch organizations, as seemed best adapted to propaganda and union activity. In response to some of the centralists, who wished to economize the cost of administration and to go even further and form vast industrial unions, Legien replied that in the present state of industry, with the enormous differences existing between the branches, this organization by branches was all that was possible. Those irreconcilable opponents, the localists, denounced the *esprit de corps* of the great unions and, insisting upon the economic helplessness of the proletariat, opposed all centralization as impeding political action. After a lively discussion the resolution offered by the workers in wood was adopted, by a vote of 148 to 37, with 11 non-voting, agreeing to the centralization by branches, but recommending that in those industries where it was possible agreements should be formed between the various branches. Within this organization the local societies were only intermediaries. The direction of strikes and the benefit funds were controlled by the Central Union, which thus became the real union.

The congress invited the local societies to affiliate with the centralized unions. These protested and withdrew, thus creating a split in the Socialist union movement, but they constituted only an insignificant minority. The general committee was retained, but it no longer conducted strikes. It retained as its duties, first, propaganda for organization of the workers; second, gathering the necessary statistics for union activity; third, investigating statistics on strikes; fourth, the publication of a journal; fifth, international relations.

Under the direction of Legien, who was unanimously elected president, it set itself painfully to work. Conditions were unfavorable. The industrial boom of 1889 had once more proved to be only temporary. This period of depression and moderate activity continued up to 1895. The unions, hindered by the large number of unemployed, frequently persecuted by the police, living always in the same legal insecurity (Hirsch, indeed, had not yet succeeded in securing for them a civil personality—in 1892-3), and finally hindered in their propaganda by the localists, paid their dues poorly and responded poorly as to statistics, but showed themselves all the more exacting. The agitation under-

taken in eastern Prussia seemed without success. From 1891 to 1893, as a result of some losses sustained in the miners' union, the union movement appeared to be even decreasing. In 1891 there were 277,659 members affiliated with the central unions; in 1892, 237,094; in 1893, 223,530.

While the political party still continued to grow until 1893 it increased by 359,000 votes, it was still a question whether the union movement really had any future in Germany. Bebel thought not in 1893; at the congress of Cologne he attempted to show the helplessness of these societies in opposition to a Krupp or a Stumm and how legislation, such as that on insurance, for example, tended to limit their field of activity in comparison with that of English trade unions.

One question especially occupied the minds of the militants. Since the establishment of the General Committee the efforts of the unions no longer found their only means of unity in the great totality of the Socialist party. The General Committee now formed the central body of the unions. Even within the party the unions had formed a new autonomous organization, and while, without doubt, this was not conducted with the idea of a revolutionary union movement in opposition to parliamentarism, and while the "*Jungen*" who about 1891 developed this position, never received any special support in the great unions, nevertheless, this dualism of management, composed of a party committee and a union commission, very soon complicated by the divergencies and personal quarrels between Legien and Auer was already very disquieting. The fact is that the whole spirit of German Socialism may be summed up in one word, organization.

At the congress of Cologne the quarrel broke out. Bebel accused certain laborers who had sent a delegate to a congress of bourgeois economists of having "gone to Canossa." Nevertheless, the party affirmed its sympathy with the unions, but the commission was discredited. This gave rise to a movement of disaffection and defiance in the union world, and fierce attacks constantly followed. It was necessary that such a condition be ended as soon as possible.

This was the laborious work of the congress held at Berlin March 4, 1896. One hundred and thirty-nine delegates were there present, representing 271,141 members. Legien as the spokesman of the commission defended its work. He dropped the old quarrels, and called attention to the fact that what was said about the indefiniteness of his plans explained the difficulties of his work. His enemies had gone so far as to demand the suppression of this costly organ of administration, and the substitution of a simple correspondent. During six sessions the struggle was warm. Finally a committee was appointed with the printer Döblin as secretary, and the resolution that it pre-

sented, with the exception of a few details, was adopted. The commission remained, but its income was reduced from five to three pfennig per member quarterly. It was refused the right to form an independent strike fund, and another committee was established alongside of it composed of delegates from the governing boards of the unions having the duty of keeping track of its work.

It continued to live, and its existence proved precisely that the great majority of Socialist unions had decided to carry on alongside of, and apart from, their political activity, the work which properly belonged to them—that properly constituted their work—the preservation and development within the present society of proletarian strength. This was henceforth possible. Their organization was assured, and it began to be unanimously accepted by all. Most important of all, after these years of trial and internal preparation, they had the necessary men. A union *personnelle* had been formed of tried and true minds, business men of the proletariat who joined to financial and tactical skill, firm devotion and energetic hopefulness. Of these, we may notice among others Legien, the president of the General Commission, Von Elm of Hamburg, Martin Secitz of Nuremberg; Timm, at present in Munich, Döblin, typesetter, and Otto Hue, a miner, all fighters from the beginning.

When German industry suddenly leaped forward, the unions were ready.

CHAPTER IV.

THE UPWARD FLIGHT.

1895—1903.

In 1895 money flowed into the German banks. Industries more and more concentrated, had perfected their technical equipment. Reserved forces of men and money were at hand. The slightest start sufficed to set things in motion. It was the application of electricity which gave this start. Motive force, illumination, tramways multiplied in every city; then came the factories for their construction; finally, in order to supply these, metal working and mining also prospered. Corporations were once more seeking for capital; 161 were founded in 1895; 182 in 1896; 254 in 1897; 329 in 1898; 364 in 1899, and 261 in 1900. Thanks to these the great industry was able to expand its energies.

Then it was that within the working masses, increased and consolidated, the union organizations grew rapidly in number and in power. The Hirsch-Duncker unions passed from 70,000 members in 1895 to 80,000 in 1897, and the centralized unions (Socialist), which for four years had oscillated between 237,000

in 1892 to 246,000 members in 1894, passed from 259,175 in 1895, to 329,230 in 1896, and to 412,359 in 1897.

Finally, that portion of the working class population which had not yet been reached by the idea of freedom, experienced the practical necessity of trade organization. The political parties which included these classes in their clientele, such as the Christian Social and Catholic Center party, commenced as a counter movement to concern themselves with these matters.

* * *

During the years from 1894 to 1897 the first Christian unions were founded and the rapidity of their development was astonishing.

To be sure they had their origin in a movement which was already old. In the first period of capitalism, amid a backward proletariat, the clergy inevitably exercise an influence. At this time the belief still rules that charity can alleviate or even cure the strange social evils that are manifesting themselves, and those who preach charity receive attention. The hopes of the laborers, who were organized, directed and restrained by the clergy, served then to reinforce these clerical philanthropies. More especially, in this Germany of the middle of the 19th century, still so profoundly bound to medieval life, the old tradition, which placed mutual associations under the patronage of the Church, lasted for a long time. Accordingly, the movement of social Christianity which commenced in 1860 with the work of Bishop Ketteler, of Mayence, a contemporary of Lassalle, and which manifested itself in Bavaria, in Westphalia, and in the Rhine country of Prussia, by the founding of important Catholic Labor Societies, has since the initiative of Stöcker in 1877, and those of the miner Fischer in 1882, at Gelsenkirchen found an imitation in the Lutheran world. The Popular Association for German Catholics and the General Union of Evangelical Laborers' Societies of Germany include, even to-day, nearly 300,000 workers.

Now, about 1891 and 1892 the workers in these societies perceived that it was not sufficient "to awake and develop among their co-religionists the Evangelical or Catholic sentiment" in order to better their condition. They often saw in their various trades the influence exercised by the unions of the detested socialists and the indispensable value of trade organizations became evident to them.

In 1891 one of the leaders of the Catholic Laborers' Societies, Dr. Oberdörffer, in order to meet this need, proposed the creation of trade sections (*Fachabteilungen*) within the societies. Dr. Hiltze, another leader, placed this idea in the by-laws, and in 1894 the General Assemblage of the Presidents of Catholic Workers' Societies at Wurtzbourg adopted them. These sections had for

their objects trade education, knowledge of labor legislation, and "finally an appeal to the employers, authorities, and government for improvement of the condition of the workers." The strike was even contemplated as a last resort.

The idea had little success; very few sections were founded. If trade action was necessary, should it be limited to those faithful to a certain Church? Strong, numerous societies were necessary. But could they unite with the unbelieving liberals, or with the socialists, those organizers of the class struggle? No, certainly not. Nothing was left then but a union of Christians, of those who believed in God, in the present society, and who agreed in hating the "fatherlandless socialists." But the leaders still hesitated about preaching even such a union.

It was the initiative of the workers which decided and the leaders followed. In 1894, when six delegates of a Socialist Union had claimed to represent all the miners of the valley of the Ruhr at an International Congress held in Berlin, a great protesting movement included unanimously all the non-socialists, Catholic or evangelical. On Oct. 28, 1894, under the name of the Union of the Christian miners of Dortmund, there was formed at Essen the first Christian union. It had a clearly trade character; it declared that if necessary it would not reject the strike as a means of carrying through its otherwise moderate demands.

So it was that the question of faith became of secondary importance. The two confessions no longer sought to use the trade unions as a means of propaganda. They wished to "suppress the old quarrels." Henceforth they had only one object, the preservation of the workers from socialist propaganda, and to keep them under their control. Since trade activity alone, of a purely laboring class character, without external control, might perhaps lead to an understanding with the socialists, representatives of the two Churches undertook to conduct the movement together. The formula has been frequently repeated in their brochures and their congresses "the word *Christian* signifies anti-socialist."

These two parties had seen correctly and it was time. Such was the need of organization that the example once given was immediately followed. In 1894 at Treves the railroad workers, in 1895 the brick-makers of Lippe, in 1896 the textile workers of Bavaria, in 1897 the miners and metallurgists of Bonn and the textile workers of Aix-la-Chapelle founded Christian unions. All proclaimed their fidelity to the Emperor and the Empire, their opposition to socialism and their conciliatory intentions.

This was all in vain at least so far as it concerned the employers. Strikes, like those of the miners at Presberg, in 1898 demonstrated their repugnance to treating with their employers, even if they were Christians.

Socialists or Christians, indeed, made little difference to the employers. But during these years of great undertakings this new increase in labor organizations disquieted and annoyed them.

By the publication of the message of February, 1890, Bueck, a representative of the industrials, had already declared that the German employers would never meet as equals the delegates from labor organizations. Alfred Krupp at the same time proclaimed that he would be master in his own workshop "like a lord within his domain."

Now during these years of prosperity, agreements as to price, cartels, and trusts, so numerous in Germany, came to reinforce this patriarchal, authoritarian spirit. To the labor organizations were opposed employers' organizations which were all the stronger because competition henceforth compelled all the producers in the same industry to stand together. The idea of utilizing this new power to harass the working class naturally occurred to the minds of the most irreconcilable of the employers. The threat of a systematic lockout was held over the German proletariat.

That which made this of still more importance was that in 1897, owing to the influence of a great capitalist, Baron von Stumm, these ideas obtained favor in high places. This was the time when German production commenced to disturb England and America. German pride saw itself master of the world. The imperialist dream began to haunt the brain of the Emperor. Capitalist surplus value was an essential thing for patriotism; the striking workers became traitors to the National cause. English industry, Stumm declared, is suffering from trade unionism. German industry is strong only because of the discipline which still reigns within it. For the glory of Germany it is necessary that discipline be maintained within the army of labor.

The unions experienced a final attack.

On the 17th of June, 1879, Wilhelm II declared that it was necessary to suppress all attempts at uprisings and to punish with the most severe punishment any laborer who should prevent his fellow laborers who wished to work from working.

On the 6th of September the Emperor announced that he would protect the *National* labor and that the law which solemnly promised liberty to those who wished to work would soon be proposed, and that this law would send to the penitentiary "whoever should prevent a German laborer from performing his work."

(To be Continued.)

EDITORIAL

The Yellow Kid in Politics.

Capitalism generally appears to the working class as a tremendous tragedy, but at times it takes on many of the aspects of *opera bouffe*. This is particularly true in the field of politics. While the whole exploiting system rests on deception, yet it is in politics that the veil is the thinnest and consequently the paint and gewgaws most lavish.

In the presidential boom of W. R. Hearst there are all the features of a first-class farce, with, as usual in present society, many of the elements of a possible tragedy. He is, in a way, the very apotheosis of all that is grotesque in capitalism. The goods he has for sale are mostly composed of his own personality, and he leaps into the public market utilizing to the fullest extent the knowledge which he possesses of advertising. Like a true capitalist, he hires even his thinking, speaking and writing done for him.

If Roosevelt with his preaching of smug capitalist morality, his bombastic but genuine strenuousness, his thoroughly trained but capitalistically molded intellect, his fearless and probably sincere defense of vested tyranny, and his generally blind worship of all the gods of bourgeois civilization, represents the best that monopolized wealth can produce, then Hearst represents all that is most contemptible in that same social organization. Hearst babbles of the same morality, or at least his hired writers do, while the rottenness of his private life is notorious. He seeks by diligent booming of his own personality to convey the same impression of strenuousness without even the slight danger that comes from shooting Spaniards in the back, and while he seeks to pose as a champion of the oppressed, and rails, by proxy, at social evils, he maintains his position as a beneficiary of all those evils and takes care never to strike at a vital spot.

A contest between the two would be a glorious spectacular end to the long tragical farce of bourgeois civilization.

The old line politicians, who recognize that a certain amount of respect and reverence for an institution assists in maintaining its permanence, have always pretended that the presidency and presidential elections were hedged about with a sort of divinity that protected them from being reckoned among the commodities in which traders of the market trafficked. Of course, those who stand behind the scenes to pull the wires that move the

puppets upon the stage know that all this is a farce, that these elections are but the business affairs of the ruling class, and that the battle of ballots is, while the workers remain unconscious of their true interests, but a part of the stage trappings by which the machinery is concealed.

Hearst in his clown-like antics has pulled down a lot of these trappings, and threatens to give the whole game away. Not for the benefit of the audience, although he screams that this is his motive; not for the purpose of abolishing the commodity character of the transaction, either; on the contrary, he simply seeks to supplant private sale by public auction that he may make a better bargain. He holds his assets in his hand, and has already shouted a first bid of a two million dollar contribution to the campaign fund to be paid on delivery of the goods.

But he cannot hope to be chosen as a satisfactory actor until he has demonstrated his ability to amuse the audience. He needs popularity. This also can be purchased. A number of newspapers and a press bureau to work up public opinion, with an army of paid organizers to manufacture enthusiasm and create a "popular demand," will supply this deficiency. All this is good business and testifies to Mr. Hearst's ability to analyze the capitalist system—or to hire the right man to analyze it for him.

A part of the make-up for a presidential candidate is a set of principles. Here, too, Hearst easily leaves all his competitors far in the rear. Applying up-to-date capitalist methods, he syndicates the preparation and publication of his principles, and with his organized staff of clever writers easily out-competes the individual efforts of other candidates. He delivers most eloquent speeches (in print) at places where "other engagements" prevent him from being physically present. His name is signed to resounding editorials, pleading all kinds of causes, but no one ever saw him writing any of these, although his photograph, taken in the attitude of thinking these great thoughts, has been published several times.

Realizing with true mercantile insight the necessity of a varied line of goods, he has a set of principles to suit all kinds of customers. He is for the destruction of "criminal trusts," but in favor of "legitimate combinations." He proves that he is a democrat by the fact that he has supported both Bryan and Cleveland on diametrically opposite platforms. He is a municipal reformer in Chicago, a Tammany man in New York, while he trains with the labor party in San Francisco. His long suit, however, is his friendship for union labor, although even here he keeps a strong line out to windward by repeatedly affirming his belief in the conservation of business interests. His friendship for union labor is shown largely in the number of broken-down fakirs that he keeps upon his pay rolls.

His able editors, especially Albert Brisbane, who heads the staff and who bears a name that should have remained honorable in the history of social movements, have told him of the rising tide of socialist thought that is sweeping over the capitalist world, and that this movement is an integral part of industrial evolution and is certain of victory. At once Mr. Hearst concludes that he will hitch his chariot on behind, far enough behind to be out of danger, but sufficiently close so that he hopes it can

bear him on to power. He has caught that portion of the socialist philosophy which declares that labor shall be triumphant, and, mixing with it just enough of a muddled collectivism to make the counterfeit easier to pass, he seeks to pose as the great labor candidate. In this connection he loudly champions labor in general, but keeps away from particular instances of injustice.

So it is that with all of his extensive news staff there are several things that seem to have escaped his attention. At one time he saw something of child labor in the South, and then it occurred to him that Southern democratic politicians had something to do with nominating the president for the Democratic party, and since then he has been content to let the children suffer without his sympathy. If we are to believe him, he prevented a Kischineff massacre, and is the special protector of the Filipinos. He howls praises of universal suffrage up North and advises negro disfranchisement down South. He can gain the slightest details of a Russian massacre, even if he has to send special correspondents to the spot, but up to the present time he has heard nothing of the military outrages in Colorado. At first sight this would seem just the sort of thing that he would revel in. It is certainly sensational enough. The Constitution of the United States and of Colorado have been used as a football; union laborers and their families have been driven from their homes, the militia used as a private police force, and all this by an organization whose avowed object is to crush those for whom Mr. Hearst professes his love, the trade unions. Nevertheless, Colorado might as well have been—and, indeed, far better, so far as the Hearst news gathering force is concerned—located on an island in the midst of the Pacific, with all communications cut off. Of course, the fact that Mr. Hearst is a heavy stockholder in silver mines, in which members of the Western Federation of Miners are working, and that those miners are actually taking his advice and voting for their own interests as a class, may have helped to blind the eyes of his reporters, especially as these votes promise to be given to the Socialist party.

In spite of all his ability as an advertiser and an exploiter of other men's intellects, Hearst would be of little importance were it not for his value as the "circus" portion of the "bread and circus" programme upon which much of the support of capitalism depends. It is probable that even his extraordinary energies at blowing his own horn would have failed to attract attention, had it not been that something of his character was needed just at this time by the ruling class of America. If this "yellow kid" can be dangled before the eyes of the American working class for a few years, it will serve to attract their attention from other matters whose consideration might prove dangerous to their masters. So it is that we begin to see some of the Wall street journals looking with half favor upon the Hearst candidacy and items are now going the rounds of that portion of the press where such items will do the most good to the effect that Hearst is a "safe" candidate, and that "business interests" would not be hindered by his success. It is always dangerous to impute too great a comprehension of social phenomena and too thorough a class

consciousness to the representatives of capitalism. But it would require no more intelligence than is possessed by the average capitalist journalist to reason out that with a coming industrial depression it might not be a bad idea to foist Hearst to the front and then label him "socialism" and declare that he was responsible for the hard times that accompanied his prominence, and it is this fact alone which makes his boom anything of a serious matter.

Even, in view of all these considerations, we still adhere to the belief expressed some months ago that the Hearst boom will fail to materialize. But it is well to be forewarned from all points, and if this bubble is to be pricked and the true inwardness of the matter to be shown up, it must be done by the only ones who have no interests to conserve by the continuance of the capitalist domination which that boom can but help to prolong. Hence, it is well worth the while of the socialists to devote a little space to it just at this time by pointing out to the worker the farcical character of the whole matter.

Owing to a combination of errors we were led to believe that the MSS. on Marxian Idealism was written by Jean Longuet, but a note from Comrade Longuet informs us that its author is Comrade Emile Vandervelde, and it is so credited in this issue. We feel that, while we cannot agree with many of the positions taken, it is one of the most scholarly presentations of this phase of Socialism ever published.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Australia.

The following from our special correspondent, Andrew M. Anderson, is interesting in view of the fact that some Socialist papers have been hailing the election of fifteen "labor" members in Australia as a Socialist victory:

The first parliament of the Australian Commonwealth has now been dissolved and the work of fooling the Australian people is now being carried on merrily by candidates of various kinds.

The two great parties in the first Federal Parliament were the Protectionists and Free-Traders. These parties were almost numerically equal, but the Labor party, holding the balance of power, gave a general support to the Protectionists, who were thus enabled to control the legislation. The tariff bill occupied a very large portion of the time of the parliament, and a tariff of a somewhat protective nature was evolved. The Labor party gave the government liberal support on this question, with but two exceptions. Seeing, however, an opportunity of making a bid for popularity they commueed with the free-traders and abolished the duties on tea and kerosene.

Adult suffrage has been obtained. An immigration restriction bill and a South Sea Islanders' bill (for the purpose of abolishing Kanaka labor on sugar plantations) have been passed. In the Federal public service bill a minimum wage-clause has been inserted, giving all federal employees over 21 a salary of at least £120 per annum. By the same act, the rate of pay given to females is made equal to that paid to male employees. By the postal act mail boats are prohibited from employing colored labor.

For all of these pieces of legislation the Labor party claims chief credit, but it is very probable that most, if not all, of these measures would have become law even if there had been no Labor party in the parliament. The Australian citizen has a taste for pseudo-democratic measures and institutions, and these measures may fairly be regarded as the reward of the agitation which existed in the country during the '90s, and which created the Labor party itself. In proof of this contention, it may be pointed out that the Federal Constitution necessitated the granting of adult suffrage. This constitution was drawn up by a convention at which labor had not a single representative. It is the movement in the country rather than the faction in the house which has accomplished the above results. It is true that all of these questions found a place in the Labor program. The Federal government, anxious to gain support and seeing that no vital principle was involved, have allowed the Labor party to believe that it has coerced them into granting these reforms.

A Federal High Court has been established very similar in constitution to the American one, and no opposition was offered to it by the Labor party.

Most of these measures have been referred to as "socialistic legislation," both by laborites and their opponents. Indeed, the candidates endorsed by the Employers' Federation (of the Eastern states) have boldly announced their opposition to "socialistic legislation." Their speeches are full of references to socialism, but the labor candidates are generally content to refer to it as a bogey got up to frighten electors. A few of the labor candidates, indeed, have said they are Socialists, but they manage to drop the subject there. Some of them even venture to say that their opponents are socialistic when it suits them. The most lengthy and pronounced reference to socialism yet made by a Labor candidate was full of reference to the postoffice and the extension of public ownership. One cannot help wondering why the Federal High Court is not quoted as an instalment of socialism. No word of the class struggle anywhere escapes from the lips of labor candidates. At present the philosopher's stone, which is going to transform the worker's economic slavery into independence, is compulsory conciliation and arbitration. In New South Wales the Labor candidate for the senate, speaking on this all-absorbing theme, said that in New South Wales "it had proved a greater boon to the fair employer than to any other class."

The Federal Labor leader has not a word to say on Socialism in his address to his electors. He has already announced himself as a hearty supporter of Chamberlain's preferential tariff scheme. Several other members of the party have also expressed their sympathy with it. The following extract from a speech by a Tasmanian Labor candidate is interesting, affording proof of the fact that the Labor party has simply become a vote-catching machine.

"He had worked for three hours to induce his party to keep the duty on potatoes, and if the farmers would support him he would fight to have that duty retained; but if he got no support from the farmers, and was elected by the miners, who were free-traders, he warned the farmers that he would vote to have the duty taken off."

Labor members have, in fact, become professional politicians, and are unwilling to allow their own interests to be sacrificed in any way. At present they are striving to raise the salary of Federal representatives and senators from £400 to £500 per annum.

In New South Wales alone have we class-conscious Socialist candidates. There the Australian Socialist League are putting forward three candidates for the senate. It is hardly to be expected that their efforts will be crowned with success, but the conducting of the campaign will be excellent propaganda work and will serve to show the straight-out Socialist vote of New South Wales.

France.

There seems to be considerable disruption in the Opportunist wing of the French Socialist party. Millerand recently voted against a proposition for universal disarmament, and as a consequence was expelled from the party. Just how much this really means, it is hard to tell. *Le Socialiste*, the organ of the revolutionary Socialists, declares that it is simply an effort to make Millerand a scapegoat upon which can be unloaded all the sins of the Jaures faction after which he can be driven out, while the party will really remain as opportunist as ever. Jaures has left *La Petite Republique* and has founded another paper, *The Twentieth Century*. Gerault-Richard remains with the old paper. Jaures gives as an excuse that the financial management of the paper was engaging in all kinds of speculations of which he did not approve.

Italy.

Since Ferri has taken charge of the *Avanti* it has doubled its circulation several times, and now issues 55,000 copies daily. It has added several men to its editorial staff and is about to inaugurate extensive mechanical improvements which will enable it to meet its increased demands.

The libel suit against Ferri by the former Minister of Marine, Bettolo, has proved a great opportunity for the Socialists to expose the general rottenness of the government. Ferri has already much more than made good the truth of the charges for which the suit was originally brought.

Japan.

Sen Katayama, the editor of *The Socialist*, is at present in Texas, having arrived in this country a few weeks ago. He proposes to spend some time in the Southwestern states in an endeavor to organize the Japanese into the Socialist party.

The Socialists of Japan held a meeting on October 8, in which a resolution was adopted opposing any war between Japan and Russia, and declaring their adherence to the principles of universal peace.

Russia.

In spite of the fact that the principal workers in the Socialist movement in Russia have been sent to Siberia, their activity still continues, as the following extract from a secret official circular, which has recently been sent to the police officials of Siberia, shows: "We have information that the political exiles are still in direct communication with the laborers and with the members of the revolutionary committees, and are thereby enabled to actively participate in their illegal activity. In this manner the exiling of the persons to Siberia fails of accomplishing its purpose. This matter must be brought to the attention of all the police in order that such persons may be more closely observed, and in all places where political exiles are located, police supervision must be made more strict and daily reports sent in concerning all political exiles. Where a suspicion arises that such people are still active in revolutionary circles, or have relations with them, unexpected searches of their domiciles by the police should at once be undertaken. The houses of the exiles should be visited as often as possible by the police and their whole correspondence must be thoroughly investigated."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Senator M. A. Hanna, boss of the Republican party and president of the National Civic Federation, has made a statement several times during the past month that is quite surprising, coming, as it does, from such a source. In an interview with Mr. Frank Carpenter, the well-known journalist and syndicate writer, Senator Hanna, in reply to the question, "If labor and capital are to combine, will not the public be ground between the upper and nether mill stones of high wages and high prices?" replied as follows: "The public! What is the public? In our country it is made up of capitalists and laborers. With the exception of a very few, every man in the United States is an employer or an employee. We are all workingmen. Some of us work with our brains and others with our hands, and the employers, as a rule, work the hardest." The salient point in this frank statement is that Hanna is further advanced than some workingmen and union officials, who actually believe, or at least pretend to, that there is a third party, or separate class, called "the public." In the February number of the *National Magazine*, published at Boston, Senator Hanna again declares, in an article contributed to that journal: "It is often asked what is to become of the non-organized consumer if an amicable alliance is made between labor and capital? But every man belongs either to the one or the other group; for that matter, he is likely to belong to both." Probably now that their prophet has admitted that the contentions of the Socialists are correct—viz., that there are no other factors in social production except labor and capital, and that the mysterious third party, "the public," has been harped about for no other purpose than to obscure the class struggle, some so-called labor leaders will also change their views. Quite likely, too, the capitalists and laborites of the Civic Federation, under the leadership of Messrs. Hanna and Gompers, will also be consistent and dump Grover Cleveland, Archbishop Ireland, Bishop Potter and other capitalists or their sympathizers from that organization. Despite the fact that Senator Hanna has made the above important admission for the purpose of aiding his scheme to make organized labor and capital "partners," and to check the spread of Socialism among the workers, his bold declaration is a distinct gain toward dissipating some heavy clouds of confusion, and the Socialists can be ever so much obliged to him.

Industrially the outlook has not improved very much during the past month, and if anything the class struggle between the organized forces of labor and capital is becoming more intensified. Undoubtedly some of our friends who are still singing the song of "harmony," though in a weak voice, will accuse the "wicked" Socialists of being pleased with the situation. But that peevish position does not change the conditions, for which not the Socialists, but their opponents alone, are responsible. Facts are stubborn things and will not down, no matter how much ill-temper is displayed. As if by magic, wage increases and movements to

shorten hours have almost ceased, and organized labor is now on the defensive, fighting to hold what it has gained during the past few years by hard struggles.

It will be recalled that fully a hundred thousand textile workers of New England were compelled to accept a reduction of 10 per cent in their already scant wages in order to cheapen production and stimulate consumption. But it seems that this wonderful scheme of capitalistic economy does not seem to solve the problem, and so the bosses of New England and the South have selected a committee to work out a plan to close some or all mills from time to time in order to "restrict the output" and maintain prices. Thus the poor wage-slaves of the textile mills are to have their meager earnings still further reduced, and just how the destruction of their purchasing power will help matters the bosses don't pretend to say. And they don't care as long as their profits are forthcoming, even though they are coined out of the muscle and bone of half-starved men, women and children.

The iron and steel workers have accepted their reductions, ranging from 5 to 40 per cent, and it is calculated that the hard-worked magnates (Senator Hanna says most capitalists work harder than laboring men) will "economize" \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 a year in wages alone. But the Morgan-Rockefeller crowd in the United States Steel Corporation is going to clean up a bit of spending money besides the direct wage cut, and the same workers who were flim-flamed with a watered stock scheme last year will be required to take another chance "to get rich quick." Secretary Trimble of the trust has announced that stock will again be sold to employes—this time at \$55 per share. Last year some 28,000 men purchased about 40,000 shares of stock, with the expectation of becoming *petite* Morgans, and incidentally to hold their jobs. They paid \$82.50 per share, but the price dropped to \$49.75, a loss of \$32.75 a share, or a total of \$1,310,000 was shorn from the bleating lambs. Now, since these same workers have stood for wages reductions and insured dividends for the fat men at the top of the heap, the price has advanced to about \$57 per share. Of course, some of those workers with capitalistic minds will be sure to nibble at the bait again—it means that their jobs will be safer than those of the men who refuse to be robbed in such a barefaced manner. Protection has been a great thing for those iron and steel workers. They have had a nice dose of piling up hundreds of million dollars for the Carnegies and Fricks, and now they are going to do the same good turn for the Rockefellers and Morgans.

The Interstate Commerce Commission recently issued several barrels of statistics, which, sifted down to an intelligible basis, show that as a whole wages during the good times last year were but a few pennies higher than in the panicky year of 1896, when gold-bug parades were organized by such gentlemen as Chief Sargent, or the firemen, to shout for "prosperity," and likewise help the manipulators into office. The commission's report also shows that the earnings of the railways have increased \$34,000,000, and that freight rates have been advanced by concerted action and competition eliminated. "No assurance of a decline in rates is apparent," says the report, "and there is no way the advances can be prevented." Yet these magnates, who have advanced freight rates, increased their profits and killed competition, are now busily chopping down wages and laying off men. Daily papers in Chicago and other railway centers announce that thousands of men have been laid off during the last few months, and that many more will follow. On the other hand railroad men throughout the country complain that the tendency of the railways is to put constantly increasing tasks upon them. Engines are built larger and heavier every year and are now drawing twice the number of cars they were a few years ago, but the

same number of employes are allowed to the train. Still another cause of complaint is the recent order of the postmaster general, which will have the effect of making every train in the United States a mail carrier and as such will be under the protection of the government. The railroaders claim that the order is unjust, and they will use every effort to defeat any bill providing for the appropriation of funds to pay train baggagemen in addition to their wages from the railroad companies for the handling of packages of paper mail, which is the purpose of the order. "There is no question but that this innovation," says the official journal of the trainmen, "was the inspiration of the railway managers rather than the postoffice department."

At this writing the miners are sparring with the operators of the bituminous coal fields to ward off the long threatened reduction of wages. It would be difficult to predict what the outcome will be. One miners' delegate put the situation in a nutshell: "The operators want more money, and if they don't get it in the shape of a wage reduction it will come in some other way, such as raising prices of supplies, rents, etc., or laying off men and holding up prices." Quite a number of men are out resisting cuts in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Colorado, Utah and one or two other states, and the drain has become so heavy on the national treasury that the convention last month was forced to increase the per capita tax. In the anthracite field the impression is growing among the men daily that Roosevelt's strike commission, which brought the "open shop" into prominence by refusing to recommend that the coal barons recognize and treat with the union, was a big bunco scheme. The miners claim that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and other concerns in the combine have blacklisted some of the hardest workers in the cause of unionism, and that their Saturday half-holiday and shorter workday advantages are being brazenly violated. In their desperation the men in the Schuylkill region appealed to the commission to prevent the constant invasion of their rights, and in a lengthy decision Carroll D. Wright, the umpire (and "workingman's friend"), not only threw them a stone, but he actually went out of his way to assure the Baers that the conditions existing before the strike had been unchanged by the commission, but that the barons could make whatever "voluntary agreements" they pleased with their employes. Says Mr. Wright: "At the expense of repetition, but in order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me recapitulate the situation: The anthracite coal strike commission did not reduce the hours of labor of company men from sixty to fifty-four per week, nor from any other number of hours to any number, as insisted in the grievance; nor did it prohibit the parties to the submission making any voluntary agreement for their mutual benefit, or perpetuate, or repeal any custom existing prior to the strike not especially made the subject of award. This interpretation, it seems to the umpire, leaves the parties just where they were at the time of the strike, and just where the award of the commission left them—at perfect liberty to fix the hours per day or per week by voluntary action. The commission did not, nor can the umpire now, interfere with that liberty." Now comes a sequel to this wholesale exploitation. It is estimated by the daily press that the tide-water valuation of the total output of anthracite coal last year was \$273,000,000, of which sum "\$73,000,000 was paid in wages to the mine workers." Labor being the largest cost in production, it looks as though Baer and his co-conspirators "divided up" the largest portion of the \$200,000,000 that was left among themselves. "You can't cram your socialism down our throats!" said some of the very conservative delegates at the recent convention in so many words. No; you can lead a horse to the trough, but he don't have to

drink. Surely, if the miners like Baerism there is nothing to prevent them from receiving their fill.

In the building trades there are mutterings of coming storms in many places when the season opens next month. The bosses are organizing and are not hiding their hostility to unionism. The structural ironworkers are still engaged in battle with the Iron League, which has been strengthened by the affiliation of the Fuller Construction Company, and other branches are becoming uneasy at the outlook. The Parry crowd is also busy, claiming that over 200 local alliances and 3,000 firms are affiliated with their association. Damage suits are coming thick and fast. Small sums of \$10,000 to \$25,000 don't seem to satisfy some of the bosses. Out in Calaveras county, California, the miners are asked to pay \$250,000 to their masters as damages; in San Francisco a horseshoeing boss wants \$100,000 from the union, and the hatters are asked to pay upward of \$300,000 to a boycotted manufacturer. Suits for smaller sums are pending in every industrial center in the country.

Meanwhile Hanna's agitation in favor of union labor becoming an "ally" of capital is becoming a leading issue among the organized workers, and there will be some warm discussions between his adherents and opponents in the unions. Of course, if it is true, as Senator Hanna claims, that labor and capital are brothers, there shouldn't be much trouble in the happy household, for no matter if wages are reduced the money remains in the family anyhow. And then if labor is laid off the capitalists will probably have to go to work to support themselves.

BOOK REVIEWS

Organized Labor. By John Mitchell. Cloth, 436 pp. \$1.75. American Book & Bible House, Philadelphia, Pa.

Few men have had a greater opportunity to make a valuable contribution to the literature of the labor movement and thereby directly assist the cause of organized labor than has John Mitchell. His prominence in the anthracite coal strike gave him an opportunity to reach the ear of a larger audience than any other man in the trade union movement of America. He had had sufficient experience to have gathered many valuable facts and he might well have written a work which would have been truly worth while. He could not have written a philosophic discussion on the trade unions, for his every public utterance shows him to lack the knowledge and the training necessary to do this, and that he has a most imperfect knowledge of social relations in general. But he could have described the growth of the trade union movement in America as he had seen it. He could have told, as but few men, the story of the struggle of the coal miners of America, since he has been a part of that struggle for many years, and no portion of the field of labor would have furnished a more interesting story. His experience as a trade union leader would have enabled him to have given a valuable exposition of purely trade union tactics, of the means by which strikes are won and lost, and organizations maintained at a high degree of efficiency. In the field of collective bargaining, especially, he could have told of the growth and present operation of the system now in vogue in the bituminous mines which is one of the most interesting known anywhere in the world. All of these things he might have done, but none of them he did, though some of them he attempted. On trade union tactics and collective bargaining he quotes almost literally from the Webbs, and on other points his treatment is most fragmentary and unsatisfactory. Instead he secured the assistance of a Ph. D., who simply brought in a little scholasticism, and, apparently, no knowledge of economics since the work is full of almost childlike errors in political economy.

He then attempts to discuss the philosophy of trade unionism, and in some fifty chapters he covers a great amount of territory very poorly. Nearly all the reviewers have quoted his recognition of the permanence of the classes of capitalists and laborers together with his statement that there is no necessary antagonism between the laborer and the capitalist. Hence, we can pass these by without again pointing out the contradictions and errors.

Even on little details of the union movement with which he should be specially familiar, there are errors. As, for example, where he declares, page 76, "there is no affiliation, however, of American international unions with organizations in Europe," notwithstanding the well-known examples of the "Amalgamated" carpenters and engineers. He throws out puffs

for the Civic Federation, and declares that the attitude of the union towards militia "should be and almost invariably is one of tolerance, if not of friendliness."

His treatment of Socialism is scarcely worthy of notice. He evidently feels that he somehow does a smart thing in always coupling together the Socialist and the Prohibition party whenever it is necessary to mention either, as if they were equally representative of the labor movement in politics.

On the whole, the work adds little to John Mitchell's reputation, and must soon be supplanted in all its features by more satisfactory treatises. Here, as at many other points, Mitchell has fallen far short of meeting the opportunity which was offered.

American History and Its Geographic Conditions. Ellen Churchill Semple.
Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Cloth, 466 pp. \$3.00.

This work is pre-eminently for the student. The writer has had a quite deep insight into sociological factors, although, as was almost inevitable, considering the point of view from which the subject was approached, she exaggerates the importance of the geographic factor and occasionally confuses economic, ethnical and geographic factors, as in her explanation of the persistency of chattel slavery on pages 280-281.

The method is principally chronological. In the first chapter on "The Atlantic States of Europe, the Discoverers and Colonizers of America," she points out many geographical factors hitherto overlooked, which assisted in determining the location of settlements in the American colonies. There is a tendency throughout the work to overestimate the importance of rivers in which she seems to follow some of the European writers on economic geography.

The chapter on "The Westward Movement in Relation to the Physiographic Features of the Appalachian System" is especially good as showing how the location of the various passes through the Appalachians determined the location of settlements in the interior. A discussion of the Trans-Allegheny settlements shows how the industrial condition here repeated the stage attained by the colonies prior to the revolution, and how, as a consequence, a similar separative tendency developed.

The social effects of mechanical inventions are not overlooked as the author points out the remarkable effect which the invention of the steamboat had upon the development of the Western country. "In 1818 five steamboats were built at Pittsburg; one at Wheeling; four at Cincinnati, and four at Louisville, or fourteen in all." * * * In 1834 there were on the Western rivers 230 steamboats, with an aggregate tonnage of 39,000, and in 1842 there were 450 boats, measuring 90,000 tons."

The effect of the Erie canal was even more important as shown by the following quotation: "The Erie canal fixed the destiny of New York City, forced it rapidly to prominence as the national port of entry, and as the center of our export trade. It shifted the great trans-Allegheny route away from the Potomac, out of the belt of the slaveholding agricultural South to the free, industrial North, and placed it at the back door of New England, whence poured westward a tide of Puritan emigrants, infusing elements of vigorous conscience and energy into all the northern zone of states from the Genesee river to the Missouri and Minnesota. The prairie lands which these new westerners cultivated were, by means of the lakes and the Erie canal, made tributary to the growing metropolis at the mouth of the Hudson. New York became now commercially, as formerly it had been in a military sense, the keystone of the Atlantic shore arch. Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Boston lost much of their importance, and did

not regain it even in part until railroads enabled them to re-establish interior connections."

She follows the geographic movements of a few industries, particularly the slaughtering and meat packing: "The industry arose in Cincinnati in 1818, and had its chief center there till 1861-62, but numerous packing establishments sprang up in Columbus, Chillicothe, Circleville, and Hamilton, all of which were located on the Ohio canals; in several towns along the Ohio, notably Louisville, along the Wabash, Illinois and Mississippi rivers; and in Chicago, where the industry began to develop in earnest only after 1850. In 1862 the center migrated westward from Cincinnati to Chicago, where it has remained ever since, though the most striking industrial specialization is found beyond on the Missouri."

Unfortunately this feature is confined to very few industries, whereas it might have been extended to all industries and constituted the most valuable portion of the book.

The work is quite well equipped with maps, although one would have preferred even more than are given, and, in some cases, specially constructed maps would have been preferable to those which are taken directly from the United States census and which are really intended to illustrate something aside from the matter in the text. Each picture is followed by a short bibliography, which is a very valuable feature. However, one is surprised to find many things which certainly belong to such a bibliography omitted. There is no mention of Thwaite's works on the fur trade or the Ohio river, and indeed the fur trade is given much less prominence than it deserves in the early history of the country. No reference is made to the works of Brooks Adams, or to the quite extensive literature on the Cumberland road, although these works cover much the same matter that is treated in the text.

Geographic Influences in American History. By Albert Perry Brigham. The Chautauqua Press. Cloth, 285 pp. \$1.25.

In this popularly written work of convenient size and simple style we have a handbook of a subject concerning which there is little popular knowledge. The treatment is largely geological, and, indeed, it is a question if too much emphasis is not laid on this point of view. The list of chapters gives a very good summary of the work. They are: (I) The Eastern Gateway of the United States. (II) Shore-Line and Hilltop in New England. (III) The Appalachian Barrier. (IV) The Great Lakes and American Commerce. (V) The Prairie Country. (VI) Cotton, Rice and Cane. (VII) The Civil War. (VIII) Where Little Rain Falls. (IX) Mountain, Mine and Forest.

He deals much with soil characteristics, showing their influence on agriculture and industrial life. Perhaps the sharpest criticism that could be made of the book is an almost complete lack of maps, something which is absolutely essential to such a work. This is, to some degree, made up by a lavish use of illustrations.

He sees a great future for the territory surrounding the Great Lakes and the new South. For the student who has little time for study and wishes a concise summary this volume is extremely satisfactory.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

More Capital for the Publishing House.

On February 4 the stockholders of the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company, by the necessary two-thirds vote, authorized the issue of four thousand additional shares of stock at ten dollars each, thus increasing the authorized capital stock from ten thousand to fifty thousand dollars.

On pages 445-447 of the REVIEW for January, we have given some reasons why those who desire to strengthen the socialist movement of the United States should subscribe for stock.

We shall not waste space by repeating these reasons. We wish this month to call attention to the actual work that has been accomplished by our co-operative company in making the best literature of international socialism accessible to the working people of America.

The Pocket Library of Socialism, of which the first number was issued in 1899, has proved one of the most effective means of propaganda ever devised. It is a series of booklets, each containing 32 pages, with a red transparent cover, just the right size to carry conveniently in the pocket or to mail in an ordinary business envelope, and light enough so that a copy can be mailed with a letter of one or two sheets without requiring an extra postage stamp. Forty numbers are now in print, and number 41, "The Socialist Catechism," by Charles E. Cline, is in press. These booklets retail for five cents each, while stockholders can buy copies at a dollar a hundred, transportation included, or eight dollars a thousand where the purchaser pays expressage. Many socialist locals find this profit of four cents a copy an important help toward paying hall rent, and traveling lecturers and organizers find that it helps pay traveling expenses. On the other hand, the booklets are so tastefully designed that, while they are printed on inexpensive paper, they sell readily at five cents to any who are interested in socialism at all, and they are far more likely to be read than cheap looking tracts, such as are usually given away. It can not be emphasized too often that if the working people want literature that is written in their own interest they must expect to pay for it, since capitalists will naturally prefer to circulate literature of a different tendency.

Other paper covered books have been issued by this publishing house at frequent intervals, from Liebknecht's "Socialism, What it is and What it Seeks to Accomplish," now in its eleventh thousand, down to the Turner Hall Debate on Socialism vs. Single tax, just published at 25 cents. These paper covered books are supplied to stockholders at a discount of one-half when we pay postage, or at a discount of sixty per cent when sent at purchaser's expense.

The Standard Socialist Series is perhaps the most notable example of what the co-operation of eight hundred socialists in book-publishing has accomplished, and it affords some suggestion of what the co-operation of four thousand more would do. It is a series of socialist books of permanent value, well printed and substantially bound in cloth, uniform in style, so as to be an acceptable addition to any library. They are, with scarcely an exception, books that are worth studying as well as reading, and they demand something more than average intelligence on the part of the reader. Now as we pointed out in this department of the REVIEW last month, a publishing house operated for profit would either let such books alone entirely, or it would publish them at high prices, in most cases probably \$1.50 a volume. We have published them to retail to any one at fifty cents, and supply our stockholders at thirty cents by mail or twenty-five cents when transportation charges are paid by the purchaser. In other words, our stockholders are getting, for the price of ordinary pamphlets, books that would otherwise cost them several times as much, if they could be had at all, and in a form fit to read, to lend and to preserve. The books thus far issued in this series are as follows:

1. Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs, by Wilhelm Liebknecht, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution, by Emile Vandervelde, translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons.
4. Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association, by Isaac Broome.
5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, by Frederick Engels, translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. The Social Revolution, by Karl Kautsky, translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, by Frederick Engels, translated by Edward Aveling.
8. Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy, by Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis.

A ninth volume, "American Pauperism and the Abolition of Poverty," by Isador Ladoff, is now in press and will be issued some time in February. These nine books alone represent an investment of about three thousand dollars, and not one of these books would probably have been accessible to American Socialists if it had not been for this co-operative company.

Of more expensive books on socialism we have published only a few, as we believe that low-priced books are what the movement most needs at the present time. We have lately, however, at a heavy outlay and con-

siderable risk, brought out a translation of the remarkable work by Labriola entitled "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History." This book is bound to be of inestimable value to the socialist movement of America in promoting clear thinking, and in putting a stop to the senseless way of using a few sets of phrases as a substitute for ideas, in applying the socialist philosophy. This book, which would cost \$1.50 if published on "business principles," is supplied to our stockholders at fifty cents by express or sixty cents by mail, our price to others being \$1.00.

The Social Science Series, issued by a London publisher, consists of about a hundred volumes, one in five of which are of the utmost value to socialist students, while the rest are of doubtful and varying degrees of utility. We have arranged to import a supply of twenty titles in this series, including those most necessary for socialists, and offer them at the same discounts as our other cloth books, making the net price to stockholders 75 cents on double numbers like Loria's "Economic Foundations of Society," and sixty cents on single numbers like Marx's "Revolution and Counter-Revolution," postage included.

One other notable service has been rendered to our co-operators within the last year, in that we have provided the best edition of Marx's "Capital" for them at the net price of a dollar (postage twenty cents if mailed) whereas this same book had previously been sold in the United States at \$2.50, a price which put it out of the reach of those who most wanted it. The consequence has been that the sale of Marx's great work in the United States has been more than doubled.

BENEFIT FROM THE START.

Our first stockholders put in their money on faith, with the expectation that the company would in time provide the books they wanted. Now every new stockholder gets the benefit at once of what the others have done, and can without delay make his selection at cost prices from a stock of books that cost twenty thousand dollars to produce. Yet the benefit is mutual. To bring out new books so rapidly, it was necessary to utilize our credit, and to incur an interest-bearing debt. To pay this interest requires several hundred dollars this year that might otherwise be used in circulating our literature more widely, or in offering it at still lower prices. The urgent thing now is to get enough stock subscribed to put the business squarely on a cash basis, where no interest will have to be paid to any one. It will be an easy matter then to expand the work of the company in whatever way seems most beneficial to the socialist movement.

There are undoubtedly hundreds of socialists who are intending to subscribe for stock in this publishing house, but are waiting for a more convenient time. To all such we wish to say that just now, with a presidential campaign a few weeks ahead, is the time when the need of more capital is most urgent. Five hundred shares subscribed within the next three months will enable us to supply the Socialist Party of America with the literature that is needed at the time when it is needed. A dollar a month for

ten months will give the privilege of buying books at cost as soon as the first dollar is received. To any one sending the full amount of ten dollars before April 30, and mentioning this announcement, we will send a full-paid stock certificate, and will also send a subscription post card good for the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW one year to a new name.

A LETTER FROM LABRIOLA.

The following interesting letter has just been received by Charles H. Kerr, from Prof. Labriola, of the University of Rome, whose "Essays on the Materialistic Interpretation of History," recently translated into English for the first time, are doing so much to stimulate clear thinking among American Socialists today. The readers of the REVIEW will learn with deep regret of Comrade Labriola's serious condition, and will join in the hope that he may soon be enabled to resume his active work.

"DEAR COMRADE: I hasten to thank you for the volume containing two of my Essays, as well as for the very interesting catalogue and your pleasant letter of the 7th inst. I shall read your translation attentively and shall not fail to note anything which may appear inexact. I will advise you of any such points in the event of a new edition which I hope may be required soon.

"As you will see, the second French edition of the Essays contains a third, which is a polemic against Masaryk. Now, in case you find it advisable to translate also my volume 'Socialism and Philosophy,' I should think you might add to it this polemic against Masaryk as Chapter XII, that is to say, before the Appendix. It seems to me that my little volume 'Socialism and Philosophy' might be specially adapted to the American public on account of its lighter style. In the event that you decide upon this translation I would ask you to advise me in time since I ought to point out to you some little corrections required to make the text correspond with the second Italian edition.

"Later when I am more settled I will write you regarding the problem of propaganda which you have suggested to me. At present I am in a very sad state. For a year and a half I have been suffering with a throat trouble and have been obliged to undergo tracheotomy. By reason of different complications I have been unable to speak for some months, and just at present, I am unable to take other than liquid food. My life is cut off. I was giving three courses at the University, my whole life was taken up with conversation, dispute and propaganda. Now I feel as if I were separated from the world. You can thus imagine my delight at seeing your translation. It seems that while I can no longer speak at Rome, you have made it possible for me to speak at Chicago.

"Accept, dear comrade, my unbounded thanks.

Yours,
ANTONIO LABRIOLA.

Rome, Jan. 20, 1904."

Regarding the suggestion of publishing Comrade Labriola's later work, "Socialism and Philosophy," the translator, who is also manager of the co-operative publishing house, desires to announce that he will make a start at the undertaking at once. The date when the book can appear will depend mainly upon the way in which the socialists of America respond to our appeal for stock subscriptions.